

The following electronic version is for informational purposes only.
The printed version remains the official version.

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1974

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 837](#)]

CONTENTS

Afternoon sitting Routine proceedings An Act to Amend the Labour Code of British Columbia Act (Bill 67).

Mr. Chabot.

Introduction and first reading — [837](#)

Oral Questions

Meeting scheduled on boxcar shortage.

Mr. Chabot — 837

Low-cost housing project in Victoria Highlands district.

Mr. Wallace — [838](#)

Discrimination against housewives under Autoplan regulations.

Ms. Brown — [838](#)

Need for income subsidy assistance for hog producers.

Mrs. Jordan — [838](#)

Surcharges on autobody shops.

Mr. Curtis — [839](#)

Negotiations with Ottawa re pipeline through B.C.

Mr. Phillips — [839](#)

Pollution control programmes in pulp mill operations.

Mr. Curtis — [840](#)

Committee of Supply: Premier's estimates.

Mr. Morrison — [840](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [843](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [844](#)

Privilege Use of unparliamentary language.

Mr. Chairman — [846](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [846](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [846](#)
Mr. Speaker — [846](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [846](#)

Routine proceedings

Committee of Supply: Premier's estimates Hon. Mr. Barrett — [847](#)

Mr. Gibson — [847](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [849](#)
Hon. Mr. Barrett — [852](#)
Mr. Nunweiler — [852](#)
Mr. McClelland — [854](#)

Division — [855](#)

Mr. McGeer — [855](#)
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [856](#)
Mr. Wallace — [857](#)
Hon. Mr. Barrett — [858](#)
Mr. Gardom — [859](#)
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [862](#)
Mr. Bennett — [863](#)
Mr. L.A. Williams — [863](#)
Mr. Lewis — [866](#)
Mr. McClelland — [867](#)
Mr. McGeer — [869](#)
Hon. R.A. Williams — [870](#)
Mr. Gibson — [870](#)
Hon. Mr. Barrett — [871](#)

Report Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills. 1st report — [873](#)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1974

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to welcome to the gallery a group of students from an outstanding independent, or private, school in my constituency with a long history in that constituency. I am referring to the students in the gallery from Queen Margaret's School in the City of Duncan, and I would ask the House to welcome them.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in the gallery today we have 58 people from New Westminster. Up until recently they have been coming over on an annual basis with an eye to possibly moving the parliament buildings to New Westminster. They've decided against that, however, and I would like everybody here to welcome the people from New Westminster for their visit today.

HON. E. HALL (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, there are 27 students in the gallery that I want to welcome and have the House greet. These 27 students are attending a United Nations seminar sponsored by the United Nations Association in Vancouver. The students come from many parts of the province, so Members should be interested in that point — that many of their areas are represented by these students.

They're in Victoria to gain some background knowledge as some will be proceeding to Ottawa and some to New York. They are accompanied by Lydia Sayle, the executive secretary of the United Nations Association in Vancouver. They are being hosted while in the capital city by the Victoria chapter of the United Nations. I hope the House will greet these 27 splendid young people.

MR. A.A. NUNWEILER (Fort George): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join me in welcoming today some students from Winton School of the distant city of Prince George.

HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources): Mr. Speaker, about these students that represent the Junior United Nations, it's not very often that I get an opportunity to welcome students from my area, since they're down near Alberta. In the area where some are even wanting to go to Alberta. But, I'd like you to give an extra welcome to those students — Miss Lois Dellert, Robert Hogan and Judy Driver from Kimberley who are on this delegation.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Mr. Speaker, this is another rare occasion when I have an opportunity to welcome somebody from the great Peace River. I would like the House to join me in welcoming Alderman Fred Newby and his wife from Dawson Creek.

HON. W.S. KING (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, also in the group of UN students that are visiting the House today we have three from the City of Revelstoke: Michael Breck, Larry Kerr and John Netzel. I would like a special greeting to go to those students today.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): I would like to welcome the remaining two people who have not yet been welcomed. (Laughter.)

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to table the first report of the task force on Crown timber disposal. The report is intituled Crown Charges for Early Timber Rights, Royalties and Other Levies for Harvesting Rights on Timber Leases, Licences and Berths in British Columbia. It is an exciting, excellent document.

Leave granted.

Introduction of bills.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOUR CODE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ACT

On a motion by Mr. Chabot, Bill 67, *An Act to Amend the Labour Code of British Columbia Act*, introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

Oral questions.

MEETING SCHEDULED ON BOXCAR SHORTAGE

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): To the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources, in view of his statement yesterday that he will not meet with the B.C.-Yukon Chamber of Mines because he felt it would breach the privilege of this House: this morning the Premier discussed quite thoroughly the provisions of the new *Mineral Royalties Act* on a hotline. I am wondering, in view of the fact that it has been discussed outside the House, whether the Minister would reconsider and meet with the people of the B.C.-Yukon Chamber of Mines.

HON. MR. NIMSICK: In answer to that question,

[[Page 838](#)]

we are meeting with them next week. And what the Premier does is what the Premier does; but what I do is what I do.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, who earlier on said the Minister of Mines would be available to meet with any major group: there will be 1,500 people at this meeting next Monday. I would ask the Premier if he wouldn't consider that the kind of major group that perhaps the Minister should be at.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): The Minister has already stated that we will be meeting as a cabinet with the representatives of the mining industry next week.

LOW-COST HOUSING PROJECT IN VICTORIA HIGHLANDS DISTRICT

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Housing if plans have been finalized for a large, low-cost housing project in the Highlands district of greater Victoria? If so, when will they be announced?

HON. L. NICOLSON (Minister of Housing): I'm sorry, would the Member please repeat the question?

MR. WALLACE: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I just would like to know for the people of this area if plans have been finalized for a large low-cost housing programme in the Highlands district of greater Victoria. If so, when are the plans to be announced?

HON. MR. NICOLSON: No, there are no plans for the method under which housing development would take place. The Capital Regional Board has been acquiring some lands in that area, and it is looked upon as a fairly long-term future landbanking project. When a suitable number of lands can be assembled we will then proceed with servicing.

MR. WALLACE: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker: I take him to say that there is no final plan as to the total type of housing or as to whether it will only be low-cost or otherwise. That decision, I take it, has not been made.

HON. MR. NICOLSON: That is correct.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HOUSEWIVES UNDER AUTOPLAN REGULATIONS

MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport and Communications, and it has to do with ICBC.

I'm wondering if he could explain to me why it is that under the disability coverage offered, men are allowed disability for 104 weeks in case of an accident and housewives are allowed the coverage for only 26 weeks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on! Discrimination.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Well, the present Autoplan provisions on no-fault accident benefits are exactly the same as they were under the laws of this province operated by the private insurance companies. It applies the same as federal operations such as unemployment insurance and other social functions of that nature. That doesn't mean it's correct.

MR. WALLACE: Change it.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I'm certainly going to take a look at it. I want to inform you that we took the existing provisions and for our first run we took it as it was.

MR. WALLACE: How long is he going to look at it?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I realize that as it was the private insurance companies had it that way. I can assure the Member we're taking a very serious look at every aspect of the rather limited no-fault benefits that have been provided.

NEED FOR INCOME SUBSIDY ASSISTANCE FOR HOG PRODUCERS

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and ask him: in light of the fact that hog prices have fallen from approximately \$54 a hundredweight on November 27 to approximately \$43 yesterday, which is resulting in an average loss per animal in cost of production of between \$20 and \$30, will the Minister consider putting the income subsidy assistance negotiations on an accelerated and emergency basis?

HON. D.D. STUPICH (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I reported earlier that one of the groups we are talking to are — not a hog marketing commission as there isn't one — but we are talking to the hog producers about the income stabilization programme for them. We're not ready to announce any details yet.

MRS. JORDAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: is the Minister not aware of the acute situation that

[[Page 839](#)]

exists in British Columbia today and that there are hog producers in this province, in light of this tremendous decrease in return over the last two months, who will be out of business today and tomorrow? Will he not give any assurance to this House and to them that the programme will go in effect and be retroactive so that they can go to their banks and receive some interim financing to bail them out at this time?

HON. MR. STUPICH: Mr. Speaker, yes I am aware. As far as any emergency programme, I have had no representations from any of the producers for an emergency programme. They want to get in on the regular programme.

SURCHARGES ON AUTOBODY SHOPS

MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transport and Communications, if he can still hear me: in view of the surcharges which are apparently being levied by automotive body shops up Island, in Prince George and in the Quesnel area, to name at least a few, does the Minister intend to amend his statement to the House of February 27 last, where he indicated that all was serene, settled and calm and that an agreement had been reached with the ARA and its autobody shop members?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I was advised of this last night and this morning I've been advised by the general manager that he's been in touch with Mr. Kinnaird. Mr. Kinnaird has promised to get back to us by noon tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, that doesn't really answer the question. This was a discussion between, as I understand it, ICBC and the executives of ARA. Does the Minister know when and if this settlement proposal is going to be voted on by the ARA membership at large?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: I have no knowledge of how the ARA operates or what the rules and regulations are. It's an association composed of automotive retail individuals, and I certainly don't run their business.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the Minister can be responsible for outside organizations.

MR. CURTIS: That's not the point, Mr. Speaker, with respect. Would the Minister agree that this was a tentative agreement reached with the ARA executive to be ratified at a later date by the membership?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: No. I was informed that agreement had been reached with the negotiating

committee for ARA, and that's the information I conveyed to you. As I told you, Mr. Kinnaird has promised to get back to us by noon tomorrow.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH OTTAWA RE PIPELINE THROUGH B.C.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would like to address my question to the Premier and Minister of Finance: in view of the fact that within two weeks separate applications will be tabled in both Ottawa and Washington for a multi-billion dollar gas pipeline — one to go across the State of Alaska and one to go in a southerly direction through the Province of British Columbia — have there been any negotiations between the Province of British Columbia and Ottawa with regard to this pipeline going through the Province of British Columbia?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a matter for the Minister concerned or for another Minister?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I thought maybe I'd ask the Premier because he would be the one who would probably be carrying out negotiations.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: If I might comment, the Member's question is not entirely clear to me, Mr. Speaker, other than....

MR. PHILLIPS: It's for the Premier.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Well, on behalf of the Hon. Premier....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I may point out that I've already indicated that I can't see how that's within the functions of the Premier's office.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, all right. I'll be quite willing to have the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources or the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) in charge of energy.

What I'm concerned about is that this is a multi-billion dollar pipeline, proposals of which will be made both in Ottawa and in Washington. What I am concerned about is: is the Province of British Columbia being informed? Have they had any dealings with Ottawa? Evidently our Prime Minister and our Minister of energy, Mr. Macdonald, has said he is in favour of this Canadian pipeline. The proposal is that it cut through the centre of British Columbia and link up with the B.C.-Montana border. I would like to know if negotiations are going on, because it involves the ecology, it involves billions of dollars worth of assessments, extra taxes, employment while it's being built....

[[Page 840](#)]

MR. SPEAKER: That's quite a speech.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the staff of the environment and land use secretariat have reviewed some of these questions, but there have not been direct discussions with Ottawa. We are aware of some of the proposals.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, I have answers to two questions that I took as notice some time ago.

One is with respect to Ocean Falls and the sale of newsprint to *The Victoria Express*. The answer is no, there have not been sales between the Ocean Falls corporation and *The Victoria Express*.

With respect to the Canadian Cellulose sulphite mill at Prince Rupert, I would advise that the Pollution Control Board have an application for permits or effluent disposal from the Can-Cel operations at Prince Rupert. The application and meetings with mill management discloses the following programme for the sulphite mills:

(a) the mill intends converting from dissolving grade to paper grade pulp during 1974-75, and this will reduce

waste lost from the bleach plant machine room area by over 35 per cent;

(b) the effluent from the pulping and red liquor washer area will continue to discharge by pipeline overland to Chatham Sound with improvements for dispersal slated for 1974;

(c) by 1976 mill management will have decided whether to (1) shut down the sulphite operations; or (2) continue with the existing mill operations. Under option (2) the mill proposes to provide the necessary recovery and all other necessary internal and external treatment to meet level (b) of the Pollution Control Board objectives by the end of 1979. The pollution control branch has requested further details on the second option. The above programme to meet level (b) is within the intent of the Pollution Control Board objectives for the planning and programme of an existing operation.

I think that covers it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PHILLIPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary from the original questioner — was it the Member for Saanich?

Interjection.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I see. We'll deal with the original question and then supplementary on the other answers.

MR. PHILLIPS: What I would like to know is: in view of the magnitude of this project, has it been discussed and has British Columbia taken a position either of being for this gigantic programme or against it?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: I'm not aware of cabinet or government position with respect to the pipeline itself. The work that has been done by the staff to date is with respect to the specifics of location as it might affect British Columbia directly.

MR. PHILLIPS: One more supplementary. This is a very large project, Mr. Speaker. Would you at some time take a question from me as notice? Would you inform the House as to what British Columbia's position is going to be on this project, and would you get together with Ottawa and see whether it's going to be good for the province, or not good for the province? Because negotiations are going to go. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that if this pipeline doesn't come through Canada then the gas fields of northern Canada will not be developed to the advantage of British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! the Hon. Member takes up the time of other questioners.

POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMMES IN PULP MILL OPERATIONS

MR. CURTIS: In response to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources' answer on the Prince Rupert situation, would he be able to tell the House if that is a comparable time schedule, as has been applied against the Crown Zellerbach operation at Port Alice?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: It's actually the Rayonier, IT&T operation at Port Alice, but I might add that in that regard it's a one-year difference. The one year additional time requested by Canadian Cellulose as opposed to the Rayonier operation is reasonable in that the pulping red liquor effluent carrying approximately 75 per cent of the oxygen-demanding waste discharges overland to Chatham Sound, which is an unconfined body of water and therefore has a much higher flushing capacity compared to Neroutsos Inlet near Port Alice.

Orders of the day.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES: PREMIER'S OFFICE
(continued)

On vote 2: Premier's office, \$202,100.

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, right from the beginning our party has questioned the excessive use of government and order-in-council appointments. We've never been very satisfied with

[[Page 841](#)]

this position that this government has chosen to use their influence for positions in high monetary gain. It's not good enough for the Premier of this province to brush aside the appointments yesterday to the boards of variance and the courts of revision, to the hospital boards and the college councils, and the like, as being of no significance.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications): That's what he was talking about.

MR. MORRISON: He said that that really wasn't important.

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): No. I said it was always done the same way.

MR. MORRISON: As the Premier has done with the questions of trust and integrity in respect to the egg-and-chicken war, so has he done in terms of trying to brush aside the patronage machine which he is responsible for establishing in British Columbia. He's doing that every day.

The real issue on the marketing boards is one of trust and of integrity in government. That is the issue that we have been pursuing for the last few days.

The issue of order-in-council appointments is one of influence and power based on the patronage system. The Premier very fondly recalls the number of appointments through the Social Credit years, which he would question in terms of patronage. But, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to challenge him to find a list of the first two years, and I'm sure that if he could.... (Laughter.) I'm going to challenge him to find a list of patronage in the first two years of the former government. I'm sure he can't find a list that you could count on the fingers of one hand. Let's face the issue squarely.

The Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) read a list of 300 names of order-in-council appointments which quickly followed upon the heels of the election of this government. I'm sure this Premier does not wish to explain a number of appointments to boards of variance of known NDP supporters. I'm sure he does not wish to explain the fact there have been 99 changes to courts of revision, and many of new appointments are known NDP card members.

Perhaps he does not wish to explain the transparent way in which community social service councils are being used by the NDP as instruments of influence and power. But this government through patronage and order-in-council appointments is taking a stranglehold on the civil service itself, the college councils of British Columbia, the hospital boards of British Columbia, the assessment appeal procedures of British Columbia, the external and powerful boards established in this province by order-in-council, the Crown corporations of this province, task forces, think tanks, et cetera used for the advice by this government and the community planning procedures of this province and the land systems in this province. Nowhere do we see any evidence that it's anything other than straight political patronage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the Hon. Member to relate his remarks to the vote before us — that is, the administrative responsibilities of the Premier or the Minister of Finance. Also, I would request that he not read his speech.

MR. MORRISON: I'm not reading it. I want to make sure my points are clear, and I am relating it exactly to the point where I believe it belongs.

He's very fond of saying these appointments will live and die with this government, but that's missing the point too. In a patronage-free society, those people and those appointments should be made on merit alone. This new government may find that these people are very valuable servants to this province, and so they should be, or they should not be appointed in the very first place. But even here, the Premier is incapable of facing the truth. The Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) appointed Harthurn as his executive assistant, and that particular friend of the government used that first order-in-council as an effective way of jumping directly into a highly paid civil service job within that department — a job which, incidentally, pays \$20,724.

I think it would be difficult to find another individual in British Columbia who has less qualifications for his position in that corporation. There are dedicated and effective civil servants that the previous government left within the Department of Mines. This government may talk about these people living and dying with the government, but when they say that, dozens of these people may indeed be very effective people. Perhaps they should be kept. And they should have the right not to have their appointments described by the Minister of this government as patronage appointments. The government makes it very clear when it talks about living and dying with this government that the key to their appointments was, indeed, patronage and that the basic criterion for their appointments was their NDP affiliation.

HON. MR. BARRETT: That's nonsense.

MR. D.T. KELLY (Omineca): Who wrote that speech?

MR. MORRISON: I did.

[[Page 842](#)]

Even the coalition government in its latter years was not so guilty of patronage as this government has been.

I'd like you to look at some of these recognized card-carrying members. Yesterday you had a list of 300. Let me just read one or two out of the list today: Alexander McLellan in the Agriculture department.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General): He's the personal assistant to a Minister.

MR. MORRISON: He's a friend of the Minister. That's the point I'm making.

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Hon. First Member for Victoria has the floor.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Peterson had his personal assistant.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health): Loffmark had his too, Baby!

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: How about A.J. Gargrave? How about Ray Haines? How about Joe Hanson, Rhodes, Roland, Criddle, Squire, Prittie, Barsby, Lauk — a whole list of them. Their prices, their wages, their former appointments.

HON. MR. BARRETT: How much does Ray Haines get?

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: I suppose the Premier's going to tell me that those people were appointed on their merit alone.

HON. MR. BARRETT: How much does Ray Haines get?

Interjections.

MR. MORRISON: The word of the Premier is already badly enough tarnished, as one shoe after another is dropped. Every day in this House we get another bombshell. The people of this province should be warned that this government is deliberately setting itself on a course where the entire machinery of the government, the entire advisory apparatus of this government goes with this government with influence and with power. There is as much government in real terms outside this Legislature now as there is within these four walls.

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) proudly stated yesterday that if he had to choose between a sense of duty to the people, and a sense of following the party line, he would choose to be dictated by the party line.

I would remind the Members opposite, Mr. Chairman, that once elected they have the responsibility to govern for all the people of British Columbia, not just for the NDP supporters. The one way to destroy that trust, to destroy the confidence and integrity of the government, is to deliberately set out on a patronage system. Certainly over time there will be merit found among the people who have all political persuasions. That's true of any civil servants, but that's what makes them free men within the government structure.

However, the real issue with this government now is whether or not their word can be trusted, and their system of government trusted, to bring the people of this province effective, open and even-handed government.

The marketing board situation has placed the trust factor of this government squarely on the line. The abuses of this government have put the integrity of this government squarely on the line. Mr. Chairman, that's the reason why this session has developed into a session where, as the official opposition, we've asked for open inquiry after open inquiry. We've asked for facts and what have we got?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Totally negative opposition. Totally negative.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): You're stuck in your own glue.

MR. MORRISON: You don't want to answer. We've had nothing in answer from either of the two Ministers whose estimates are before this House at this point. Mr. Chairman, it's time that the government opposite realized that the opposition has asked these questions so that the air can be cleared and that the real issues of trust and integrity in government could be put before the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman, we have had so far in this province questions on why stock trading was not suspended when this government started dealing in private corporations. We've had open charges on the streets of Vanderhoof by the elected mayor that blackmail was a factor in the Plateau Mills deal.

We've had open questions about unnatural trading patterns on Columbia Cellulose. We've had questions on the radio and in this House on the background of taking over Dunhill. We've had citizens, with nothing to gain personally, making sworn charges that this Premier used physical threats during his interference

[[Page 843](#)]

with the marketing board.

We've had open charges in this House by the leader of the Liberal Party that two Ministers of this government have lied to this House. Can't the government now see that the real issue is not any narrow concern with any of these situations?

The real issue is the way that this government has used and abused power. Can't the government now see that the people are not questioning this government on any narrow political partisan basis?

Doesn't the government understand that without trust and integrity in government being clearly established, the very existence of a free parliament is at stake?

HON. MR. COCKE: Tell Dan he can do better than that.

MR. MORRISON: The official opposition wants it clearly on the record that these urgent requests for full inquiries on all these fronts discussed in recent days cannot be brushed aside by any arm waving. The issue is truth. The issue is integrity. The issue is the abuse of power, and...

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver-Little Mountain): Dollars, dollars.

MR. MORRISON: ...as the leader of this government, Mr. Premier, you should not duck these issues any longer.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the official opposition presented to this House a list of misinformation in terms of orders-in-council, and after being corrected, they walk right back into the same bag again — for what reason, I don't know.

I think it should be interesting to note, before I go into a second part of my answer, first of all, that the material had to be prepared for the official opposition by a research officer. The research officer is appointed by order-in-council, because it is essentially a political appointment. The order-in-council named by the official opposition included one Dan J. Campbell and Grace McCarthy.

MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap): Who are they?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Now the whole idea of orders-in-council, and that approach to order-in-council appointment — as well as with the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party — is to have someone who is tuned in to that particular party's approach, philosophy and goals. Otherwise, there's no need to hire such a person.

In the past in British Columbia we had Ministers allowed to hire staff outside of the civil service — namely, P.A. Gaglardi and the Businessmen's Alliance. We made it very clear that the time-honoured British tradition of hiring through order-in-council applied to Deputy Ministers. Two of those were named yesterday by the speaker, leaving the impression that somehow they were NDPers.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, are you saying, Madam — and I hope you apologize to the Deputy Minister of Travel Industry — that he was a political appointment? His name was read yesterday and he was on staff for over 25 years. When I asked him.....

AN HON. MEMBER: 40 years.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, I would hope that you would certainly...40 years, Mr. Colby's service.

Then on top of that, listed in the names yesterday, as I had to point out yesterday, was a Mr. George Brodie with 33 years service — 33 years government service — a government agent in Nelson, and appointed to a hospital board.

MR. PHILLIPS: Quit fogging the issue.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Quit fogging the issue?

Mr. Chairman, considering the validity of their research, they should fire their order-in-council appointment and find someone who can do it sensibly.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: The Acts we inherited from the former administration included the hospital boards, boards of variance, police commissions, courts of revisions, Deputy Ministers. We have followed every single Act

that the former government followed.

We have named order-in-council assistants to the Ministers, and I said clearly at the outset that those would be appointed by the Minister and they would fall with the Minister. They would not be buried in the civil service to be protected by the *Civil Service Act*.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BARRETT: They were straight political appointments, just as your assistants are political appointments in every other party, and that is the way it should be, Mr. Chairman. That's the way it should be.

The British system functions on the basis of the Minister being able by order-in-council to appoint his Deputy. We have followed the tradition, and we hope that whoever succeeds us will follow the same

[[Page 844](#)]

tradition and not go back to the kind of games that were played by that group over there when they were in power.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest variance from civil service hirings was the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen, when the former Minister of Human Resources, or Welfare, or whatever he was known as — a high-flyer, or whatever else he was known as at that time — was hiring out of his own department and bypassing the Civil Service.

Aside from the order-in-council that we are required to use by legislation, and aside from the order-in-council appointment that we have done in terms of Ministerial assistants, we have used the civil servants and the civil service completely. And it is a far better record than the former government ever had, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, we've had an interesting intervention from the Premier of the Province. He talked about how the British system functioned. He talked about the way it should be. He talked about the correctness, or otherwise, of using orders-in-council. That is precisely the subject I would like to continue talking about.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, when I made an intervention in this debate on the estimates of the Premier, apparently my remarks were misunderstood, or not heard. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on some of these again.

First, on the question of the way it should be, on the question of truth in government, on the question of how the British system functions — to quote the Premier's words of a few seconds ago — there is an issue, a real issue, of truth in government. This is an issue which cannot be ignored by ignoring the charges made, the claims made, or the affidavits sworn. It's fundamental to the British parliamentary system that things like this be cleared up.

Now we have attempted over the past few weeks, my colleagues and I, to clear this matter up. We have attempted by questioning the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) during the question period. We have attempted, during the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, to question him again.

We want to know, Mr. Chairman, where the truth is and where the lack of truth is in affidavits sworn by citizens of British Columbia, former members of the Egg Marketing Board and members of the Broiler Marketing Board. We want to know where the truth lies because it's fundamental to the British parliamentary system, to again quote the Premier, "for matters such as this to be cleared up."

We questioned the Minister in his estimates. At first he claimed amnesia. At first he claimed it was an unimportant question which he was not interested in trying to remember, and his quotes are on the record.

We questioned him over days, and his memory improved slightly but not very much.

But there was one thing I would like to mention, because the issue here was the accuracy of impressions conveyed and statements made about meetings. These meetings did not just have two people present, Mr. Chairman.

They did not just have present the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier and the people who swore the affidavits. Both these meetings had substantial numbers of civil servants present, and they were in a position to clear up the record.

They were in the position, had they been questioned by the Minister of Agriculture, to have come forward with statements which would have indicated where the truth lay and where the falsehood lay.

Yet in the last day of the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, he made a quote which I'd like to repeat at this time. He stated, "My Deputy has not asked me whether he should, or should not say anything to the press. If he were to ask me I would advise him it would probably be in his own interests" — mark my words, Mr. Chairman — "in his own interests and in the interest of the industry as a whole if he declined to comment on what is obviously a political attempt to bring disfavour on the Minister of Agriculture."

Those were the people who had the opportunity of clearing up the records. Those were the people who were present at these meetings, were sitting next to the Minister during his estimates, and could well have shed light on what actually transpired.

We were interested that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) did not ask these people for their views, that he indeed suggested to them, as I have indicated to you in that quote "they had better not give their views."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member relate his remarks to the Premier's estimates?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Because if the civil servants I am talking of had been permitted to speak, or even encouraged to speak, it would have been possible to clear the name of the Premier. That is the issue we are discussing, Mr. Chairman. That is the issue.

There were a number of questions which we felt had to be answered. We wanted to know the accuracy of these affidavits because they are sworn affidavits. They are statements, which if incorrect, would lead these people to be prosecuted for perjury.

AN HON. MEMBER: Aw, ridiculous!

HON. MR. MACDONALD: You couldn't prosecute a fly!

[[Page 845](#)]

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: "False statements under oath cannot be prosecuted," says the Attorney-General. Your estimates come up next, Mr. Attorney-General, and we are going to look forward to you letting out most of the people now in British Columbia jails on the strength of affidavits?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member confine his remarks to vote 2?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the fact is: civil servants were involved in these affidavits. Their names come up frequently. Civil servants carried messages back and forward. Civil servants were present. Civil servants must have heard what apparently the Minister of Agriculture could not hear, what apparently members of the Egg Marketing Board and Broiler board did hear.

So we have a situation in which the civil service were told: "It is not in your interests to speak out."

We in this party have asked for a judicial inquiry. I have not checked to find out how many times we have asked, but I imagine a dozen, perhaps 15 times, would be a conservative rather than a generous estimate. The fact is: there has been no judicial inquiry or any suggestion we are going to get the judicial inquiry. Why not? Why not have a man, a supreme court justice, independent of politics, independent of partisan debate in this Legislature, call before him the people who were present at these meetings; put them on oath and say: "Gentlemen, what is your recollection? Where does the truth lie?" Why not have the name of the Premier cleared if indeed he has been libeled, or have the names of these people who swore these affidavits cleared, because I am sure that the statements of the

Minister of Agriculture on the weekend constituted libel of them.

Why not have an independent, non-partisan inquiry? Time after time after time this was denied to us. There are questions, questions that we cannot avoid, and these affidavits raised them. Questions such as: Did the Premier tell Mr. Brunson that there would not be any court case against Mr. Sy Kovachich? Did the Premier say charges against Mr. Kovachich must be substantially reduced? Did the Premier indicate to Mr. Brunson that the Kovachich order was not to be a precedent, and that if any other producers got out of line, they were to be stepped on? Did the Premier inform the board it had to draft a new agreement with Kovachich that very day? Did he or did he not? Was the Premier aware of Kovachich's affiliation?

We would like to know whether the Premier informed Mr. Morgan, who was present at the meeting, that in response to his questions as to what assurances the board would have that Mr. Kovachich would abide by the dictated agreement that — and here is the quote of the Premier as relayed by affidavit: "...if he does not abide by his part of the agreement, I will kick the crap out of him, and if the egg board does not abide by their part of the agreement, I will kick the crap out of you." Was this said at that meeting?

Did the Premier say to Mr. Brunson at the meeting: "If anything is said outside of this office, I will deny every word I said." Did he or did he not make that statement? A direct promise. A promise to lie. A promise which we'll see whether it has been kept or not; whether a judicial inquiry will see whether it's been kept or not.

These are real questions, Mr. Chairman, and we have raised them in the Legislature time after time in the last two weeks — the real questions that we have tried to have answered by civil servants, by the Minister of Agriculture, by a public inquiry, a judicial inquiry.

Now, the Premier has said yesterday: "Tell the whole truth." Today he says, "We've got to make sure that the British system functions. This is the way it should be." Well, the way it should be is to clear up the issue as to whether or not these men swore affidavits on which they have perjured themselves or whether, indeed, the Premier has told the truth.

Mr. Chairman, two days ago I met in my office with Mr. Brunson, the former head of the egg board. That was the first and, indeed, the only time I have ever met the man. My only other contact with anybody involved with these affidavits was a phone call to his wife, a brief phone call, setting up that meeting in my office. I was convinced of one thing after my conversation with Mr. Brunson. That is: Brunson is an honest man; Brunson has been telling the truth.

The situation, therefore, that I am faced with is this: I cannot on the one hand believe Brunson, and on the other believe both the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich). That is not a minor variation of recollection; this is a substantially different story as to what happened. It is not possible for both, or I should say all three, to be right.

We have asked, and I ask again, for a judicial inquiry to get to the bottom of this — an impartial inquiry outside the confines of politics. I think were this done, some of the difficulties that have been faced in the past — in the Gaglardi affair or the Strachan affair — would not recur.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You know that was a phony political thing.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, in the light of my inability to believe both Brunson and the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, I am led to one conclusion. The conclusion is this: the Premier

[[Page 846](#)]

and the Minister of Agriculture have lied...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: ...have deliberately lied in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I'm the offended one....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order, please! I would ask the Hon. Second Member for Victoria to rise and withdraw his remark stating the Premier has lied.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman. I'm the offended authority. I have the right to ask the withdrawal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't fight over it!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Hon. Second Member I have requested that you withdraw the statement that the Premier lied, or that the Minister of Agriculture lied.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I cannot withdraw a statement which I believe to be accurate. And the statement is: the Premier lied to this House.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would read to you standing order 40(2): "No Member shall use offensive words against any Member of this House." Therefore, I order the Second Member for Victoria to withdraw his remark.

HON. MR. BARRETT: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Would the Hon. Premier state his point of order?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Is it not right, Mr. Chairman, that the rule is that the offended party has the right to ask for withdrawal?

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver-Point Grey): You don't even know the rules!

HON. MR. BARRETT: You're trying to tell me I don't know the rules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, any Hon. Member has this right, but the Chairman has the duty to impose the rules of this House, so I would order the Hon. Second Member for Victoria to withdraw the statement that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture lied to this House.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, for the third time today, and the fifth time in the last two days, I claim the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture have lied to this assembly in the affair of the Egg Marketing Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the Hon. Member if he is refusing to obey the order of the Chair?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: That would be a logical assumption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as it is clear.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Straight smear. Straight innuendo. Your own statement today was "accuracy of impressions." That was your own words today. Is that the best you can do? That is pretty poor.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, while in Committee of Supply, the Hon. Second Member for Victoria stated that the Premier and Minister of Agriculture lied to this House. Upon requesting that he withdraw these words, he refused. When I ordered him to withdraw, he also refused.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know, the duty is on the Speaker to preserve the dignity of the House and the authority of the Chair, under standing orders 19 and 20. Regretfully, I must again ask the Hon. Member if he will withdraw the remarks, but before doing so, were the remarks passed in the heat of a debate?

AN HON. MEMBER: What difference does it make?

MR. SPEAKER: It makes considerable difference under standing orders 19 and 20. Everybody errs, you know, but we are all able to progress.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that over the last 10 days, upon the consistent refusal of the government to order a judicial inquiry, there have been heated moments on this side....

[[Page 847](#)]

MR. SPEAKER: But not today?

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that both today and yesterday I said it on careful reflection.

MR. SPEAKER: I see. And I must now order you, according to *Standing Orders*, to withdraw the remarks that you've made.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to withdraw the remarks if a judicial inquiry is established so we can get the truth of this. Otherwise under no circumstances will I withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I have no other course open but to ask you to leave the chamber.

That, of course, is for the rest of the sitting.

AN HON. MEMBER: The rest of the session?

MR. SPEAKER: I said the rest of the sitting.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

On vote 2.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I think it's important, since I didn't have the opportunity to raise the question of withdrawal, to reflect on the accuracy of statements. That was a statement made by the Member — accuracy of impressions. I just want to read into the record page 20 of the Garrish report and let the matter rest there.

Interjections.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have a right to my place in this House without the yelling and the smears of the opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Smokescreen!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw the word "smears" as applied to the words of the opposition.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Garrish report...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the Hon. Premier to withdraw the implication that there was smearing from the opposition as he stands in his place.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that there was an impression of smearing from the opposition. It was no impression at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Hon. Premier to....

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): He wants to be thrown out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Premier continue?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to quote from page 20 the relevant section of the Garrish report related to this whole issue that I think is germane to every step that has been taken, both by the opposition and by others.

"On the other hand, if the present situation is allowed to remain" — that is, with the Egg Marketing Board — "inevitably the board policies will reflect the views and the wishes of the majority of the producers presently concentrated in the lower mainland. If a change is to be brought about, it will certainly have to be as a result of a policy decision at some higher level than the Egg Marketing Board.

"In practical terms, there is no way that I can see of the Egg Marketing Board being able to institute policies that are in any way at variance with the interests of the producers in the lower mainland. If no change in basis of representation is made — and it is difficult to justify a change as the pattern of production now exists — then it would appear that some sort of review procedure or some referee on board policy matters must be established at government level to ensure that minority groups within the board's jurisdiction have available to them a court of appeal from board orders and board regulations."

The real crux of this matter, in my opinion, is the right of the small farmers on Vancouver Island, the Interior and the north and east Kootenays to have a fair chance at egg marketing in this province.

MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano): Mr. Chairman, I can hardly believe the words the Premier just spoke when he said that the real crux of this matter has to do with the Garrish report. The real crux of this matter, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Chairman, has to do with whether or not you were telling the truth to the House on February 25 and February 26.

I'll read it into the record again. On February 25, you were asked by the Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) whether or not on October 26, 1972, at a meeting in his office, the British Columbia Egg Marketing Board was asked to substantially

[[Page 848](#)]

reduce their financial claim against a Mr. Sy Kovachich, an NDP supporter from Taber Lake in the Fort George constituency, as referred to and subsequently commented upon by the Premier in *The Province* newspaper on February 21 and 22. The reply of the Premier: "Mr. Speaker, they were not asked or ordered or suggested to be ordered to do anything."

Later on, after a supplementary as to whether the Premier had told anyone to draft an agreement, the Premier said: "I told no one to draft an agreement."

HON. MR. BARRETT: I suggested they get together.

MR. GIBSON: That's what *Hansard* says, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Chairman.

Then we have an affidavit from Mr. Brunson, substantially confirmed by Mr. Unger. The affidavit said that that meeting of the egg board was informed by the Premier that "there will be no court case against Sy Kovachich' or similar words to the same effect" — that's an order, when it comes from the Premier, Mr. Chairman — and that they were further informed that "the charges against Kovachich must be substantially reduced." That also is an order. It goes on in that affidavit — similar contradictions.

That's just one case, Mr. Chairman. The next case is much more recent. The next case is February, 1974. On that occasion, the Premier in *Hansard* of February 26 said, relating to broiler quotas: "Mr. Speaker, I did not order anyone to be given any quotas related to broilers." And he said later: "I did not direct that a committee of three be struck to allocate broiler quotas." Very simple, clear, direct recollections.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Or words to that effect.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Attorney-General, there are no "words to that effect" in this case.

In the affidavit filed by Mr. McAninch, points 11 and 12 — and I imagine you have studied them carefully — said that....

Interjection.

MR. GIBSON: No, you're not interested, Mr. Member. I'm not surprised you're not interested because it has to do with the word of the Premier, and you're pretty disturbed about it, through you, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections.

MR. GIBSON: The testimony of Mr. McAninch referred to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Peterson, who was quoting the Hon. Premier, and in quoting him noted that he had ordered that certain quotas be allocated. Mr. McAninch says the Deputy says that when the Premier said he didn't issue any orders.

Then it says in point 12:

"That I was further informed by the said Mr. Peterson that Mr. Barrett had directed that a committee of three be appointed to determine allocation of broiler permits on the basis ordered by Mr. Barrett."

The Premier said in the House on February 26: "I did not direct that a committee of three be struck to allocate broiler quotas."

Now, Mr. Chairman, surely the Premier should have no difficulty understanding that the question here goes far beyond quotas, be they broilers or eggs. The question here is: who is telling the truth? And there is directly contradictory evidence. The people of British Columbia know that there is directly contradictory evidence, and they're concerned about the fact that apparently the highest office in British Columbia has breached the fundamental principle of trust on which this Legislature has to operate. The word of a Member, particularly the word of a Premier, must be sacred. If that is sullied by this kind of a cloud over it, and if the Premier refuses to take the simple steps open to him to discharge that cloud, to remove it or to prove it, then to me he's not doing his duty, and he's in breach of his trust to the citizens of British Columbia.

It's so simple, Mr. Chairman. We're not talking about a lot of people. We're talking about 16 people that were at those meetings. Four of them have sworn affidavits, which relate to orders given by the Premier, and the Premier has denied that such orders were given.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I wasn't even at one meeting. I wasn't even at the second meeting.

MR. GIBSON: You were quoted at the second meeting, Mr. Premier, by a Deputy Minister.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Now you're going to convict me on hearsay.

MR. GIBSON: Quoted by a Deputy Minister.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh, come on!

MR. GIBSON: I'm sure you'd want to give that Deputy Minister a chance to say something about that statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, to come to the aid of the Liberal party.

[[Page 849](#)]

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh, Garde, aren't you embarrassed by all this?

MR. GIBSON: A quarter of all the people at those meetings have sworn out affidavits, and the Premier has said things to this House directly 180 degrees at odds with those affidavits. And there are another five people, outsiders at those meetings, who could give testimony if they were called by an inquiry. And there's another person who's completely lost his memory, apparently — the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich). And then there's five other people who are civil servants who have effectively been muzzled by the implied orders of the Minister of Agriculture in this House.

So with that short history, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that it's unbelievable to me that the Premier doesn't understand what the crux of this matter is. The crux of this matter is his honour and his word. He should take the steps open to him to clear it up through the holding of a public inquiry to get to the bottom of this mess.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): I would like to refer back to two or three statements that have been made in the debate this afternoon. In one the Premier got up after my colleague, the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison), listed some names that are serving on a patronage basis under the Premier's hand; and he tried to again cloud the issue by drawing in side points. I would just pose to him perhaps that he would like to comment on the names that sit in the area of the Okanagan Valley.

There is the name on the hospital board, under the Premier's hand, of Winters — one Gerry Winters — appointed to the hospital board following his defeat by the current sitting Member of the Legislature for North Okanagan.

HON. MR. BARRETT: How about Mr. Morton, an ex-Social Credit candidate?

MRS. JORDAN: Then we have in the Okanagan on our regional college council, Mr. Chairman, many interesting names: O'Neil, a delightful lady, but the wife of a former defeated NDP candidate.

Then we look down the list and we find the name Mephan residing under the Premier's hand — a member of a very well-known and staunch NDP family. We look down the list and we find the name Bond — the wife of a former NDP candidate.

Then we saw, Mr. Chairman, a member of that committee who has served the regional college council for many years, a lady, who was a government appointment — and up to this day I do not know of what political faith — and who resided as chairman of the regional college council. This lady is no longer the appointment from the North Okanagan, nor is she chairman of the regional college council. We have a new name representing the people of the North Okanagan on that council, residing under the Premier's hand, and that name is Pringle. Its association is as the defeated NDP candidate in the previous provincial election.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that in mentioning these names in this House I am in no way attacking these people as individuals.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh!

MRS. JORDAN: They are very nice people.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Very nice people; they just don't belong to your party.

MRS. JORDAN: But what does concern me as the MLA, Mr. Premier, which you just don't seem to understand, is that you are indulging in political patronage in the constituency which I represent in a manner that has never before been seen in British Columbia...

HON. MR. BARRETT: Oh!

MRS. JORDAN: ...not even in the coalition days. And what is even more concerning to the people in this area — and it is reflected around the province as you continue this programme — is that you are in fact bringing partisan politics into education.

You asked if I would apologize to the Deputy Minister of Travel Industry. I have no reason to apologize to him. I would ask if you wish me to apologize to the Deputy Minister of Education.

This is a matter of serious concern, Mr. Premier, this patronage, and it is blatant. It is not only wrong in the context of your responsibility to the people of this province; it is wrong to these people who might well serve in various areas, were they not so heavily tainted with your patronage reputation that is now under attack.

Mr. Chairman, along with the situation that we have witnessed this afternoon, where the integrity and the word of the Premier is under attack — and we have seen a Member of this House expelled for sticking to his principles and standing by the people — I think it's even more shocking to have sat here and listened to the Premier of this province try to cloak himself in the Garrish report — to try to use a report commissioned by a previous government to cloak his guilt. I suggest that his actions are doing a great disservice to another citizen in this province — Mr. Garrish himself.

I would ask the Premier, if he is so fond of using the Garrish report, why didn't the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) refer to the Garrish

[[Page 850](#)]

report in his estimates?

HON. MR. BARRETT: He tabled it!

MRS. JORDAN: Tabled it! Mr. Premier, this report has been sitting in your office for months. This whole issue has been here for months.

Mr. Premier, the House has been sitting three times since this whole issue came to your office; and that is what is at question.

The Premier likes to refer back to the Garrish report. He said how it was commissioned by the other government and the former administration, and indeed it was. But they recognized then, as is stated in the report, that the matters of concern in the poultry and egg marketing business were such that more time and more study were needed.

Consistently the Premier has used this report out of context to support a position that is not only not acceptable but now is under great suspicion.

I would like to point out some of the points that the Premier has left out in the Garrish report. Mr. Garrish says on page 5:

"Further, it should be stated that the survey group quickly became aware that the job confronting the Egg Marketing Board was in no way an easy one, that in many cases it was breaking new ground with no one else's experience to draw on, and that its problem was very materially complicated by the patterns of egg production throughout British Columbia" ...et cetera. "Generally speaking, the survey team was impressed" ...

...by the work of this board, and in a relatively short period of time.

Then he goes on to say, when he's discussed some of the problems of the board — and this is what the Premier didn't quote:

" This decision" — relating to one of the matters he's discussing — "would have to be made at some level above the board because in my opinion it is impossible for the board, as presently constituted, to reverse its position. A very tempting solution would be to simply amend the scheme in line with what is now taking place, but in the long run this seems certain to reduce or eliminate any flexibility in the operation of the quotas of the board, and to make it more difficult for the development of an increased production in the outlying areas of the province."

He cautions the Premier that Band-aid approaches would not be helpful in the long run, and would not be acceptable. He goes on to say on page 15:

"Any changes to the quota system will require much more study than the survey group was able to give."

Again, a recommendation — not for the Premier to stick his finger in the pie and flex political muscles, but much more study. He goes on to say again on page 21:

"The concern now should be that all policy decisions are made with the fullest possible knowledge of the facts and for this to come about, people who have had this knowledge must be included in the discussions and be free to make their contributions."

Mr. Chairman, the Premier has said in this House in the few days that he doesn't know anything about the workings of the board. He just knew what they were doing was wrong. The report he chooses to try and cloak himself in has told him that there must be people with knowledge and the fullest possible understanding, in a broad context, in all these discussions.

Mr. Premier, he didn't say to you, "Abuse your office." He told you over and over again in this report that there were problems — in spite of the fact that the board had done an excellent job in many ways — that it should go to a higher level of government and that it should be examined in depth.

What he was telling you, Mr. Premier, was to bring it to this Legislature, where it should properly be discussed. Or utilize through this Legislature the agriculture committee, or through this Legislature appoint another committee to examine it in its fullest concept, so that what is potentially an excellent programme can continue to put money in the producers' pockets.

Mr. Chairman, that is summed up today in the words of Mr. Garrish himself. When he was interviewed as to his view of what was happening in the Legislature, I believe he quite rightly said he didn't wish to comment because it did not relate to his report; but he did say, and I quote:

"Garrish said the three-member study group he chaired recommended to the government that a much longer and more detailed investigation of problems in the egg industry be undertaken."

Mr. Chairman, along with the evidence that has been presented on the ability of the Premier to tell the truth, I submit the report that the Premier himself is trying to use as a shelter. I submit that it refutes every word he said in this debate in relation to why he used political muscle and jeopardize his position as Premier in this province.

Mr. Chairman, if one examines the record of this government and the problems in British Columbia, and the fact that the whole issue here is truth in government and the integrity of government, we can't rest solely with the egg-and-chicken war.

Wherever we look in British Columbia we see that we simply cannot narrow down this question. It is the broad spectrum of the actions of this government that are now under question in relation to the

tendency to abuse extreme powers, both by the Minister and the Premier, and to whether or not the people of British Columbia can feel trust and confidence in their own government.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of Plateau Mills is one that can be used as a classic example. And I say one because, as we look around British Columbia, we see that these questions arise more and more as this government gallops into private enterprise, elbowing its way in, muscling its way in. It's happened in the poultry business, the Columbia Cellulose deal, Dunhill and Plateau Mills. Everywhere there are serious questions being asked and serious charges being made. And all we get from this Premier is, "It's nonsense, it's nonsense."

Let's just look and see what some of these people are saying. Regarding Plateau Mills: on June 28, 1973, a respected businessman in the Province of British Columbia, in fact two of them, one a chartered accountant, suggested that they had been muscled out by this government. The same gentlemen — and the spokesman was Mr. Gerald D. Phillips — said: "The shareholders of Columbia Cellulose accepted a \$2 million loss in their sale because the men were afraid they might be hurt financially by subsequent action of this government." And the Premier says, "Nonsense."

What did Mayor Everett Stevens have to say about this action? I assume the Premier would feel that a duly elected mayor has the right to expect that his word would be accepted every bit as much as that of the Premier. Mayor Everett Stevens of Vanderhoof said: "Williams' justifications for buying the mill are totally invalid, and the Minister is speaking out of the side of his mouth." One more example of a serious question of integrity within this government.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, what a web we weave when first we practise to dabble in philosophy in the marketplace.

It's not confined to individuals; it's confined in editorials. On Friday, June 28, 1973, in the *Sun* they said:

"How's that again, Mr. Barrett? So the government came to the rescue of Plateau and bought the majority interests in the company for \$7 million. But it turns out that there was another Canadian offer being put together, with the government's knowledge, to buy Plateau for \$10 million. The Canadian bidders are screaming 'foul' with some apparent justification. "

Now, why Mr. Premier — through you, Mr. Chairman — would your Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) and one of your MLAs, who I'm sure you're very familiar with, Mr. Chairman, go to a group of Canadians and say "There is an opportunity to buy out a company and make it Canadian"? And these people, on the advice of your Minister and your MLA, went to a great deal of work to present a programme that just happened to come in too late. And the Premier says, "Well, the shareholders were glad to have our offer — \$2 million less."

I suggest to you that the shareholders saw the writing on the wall. They saw that they were dealing with a government where integrity did not count, and that they were dealing with a government that was prepared to use muscle, as evidenced before this House. Mr. Chairman, I suggest these people took their money and ran because they don't want to have anything more to do with British Columbia.

And what is even equally as distressing, Mr. Chairman, is that at the same time this is going on, the Premier is spending tax dollars — going to the United States, going to other countries to encourage investment in British Columbia. The question that comes to mind, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Premier is: do you not understand what your actions are doing not only to your own position as Premier in this province, not only to your own position as Premier in this province, not only to the positions of your Minister, but to the very integrity of this jurisdiction?

If the Premier doesn't understand, it is that he just doesn't want to. In 18 short months he and his colleagues have become so arrogant that they simply do not care about the future of this province and the future governments of this province who must deal in the international marketplace, and whose word must be respected. Do they not care about the reputation that British Columbians have worked so hard to build over the last many years in regard to their integrity?

Mr. Chairman, it doesn't stop there. Even one of his own questions the actions of this government: Jack

Monroe. Mr. Monroe is the IWA regional vice-president, and on Friday, June 29, 1973, in relation to the Plateau Mills situation and controversy, he said: "He thinks the government is making a mistake."

There are headlines everywhere: "Heat on the Government to Resell Mills." *Vancouver Sun*, June 29: "Beech charged earlier that the government had used terror tactics." The *Sun* editorial on Friday, June 29 said: "Feeling the pressure."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member relate these remarks to the estimates before us?

MRS. JORDAN: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if you are not aware, the Minister of Finance and the Premier of this province, whose estimates we are debating now and whose salary we are debating now, is the very man who must assume the responsibility not only for the direct charges against him in the chicken-and-egg war, but in fact in relation to all the charges that are

[[Page 852](#)]

being raised in this province as to the integrity of this government, as to the ability for this government to tell the truth. Our Party has asked for an inquiry in relation to all these matters so that this can be cleared up to everyone's satisfaction. It should be impartial. The Premier has nothing to lose. If he is innocent, then this judicial inquiry will clear up all the charges against him. If he isn't, Mr. Member, then the integrity of the parliamentary process must be honoured, not for the sake of this government or that man, Mr. Chairman, but for the sake of democracy and for the sake of British Columbia itself.

I find it extremely strange that everywhere you look, in relation to charges against this government and this Premier, that the only answer we get from the Premier, is "Fowl." He accuses the *Sun* of cheap political politics; the egg and market people don't tell the truth. "Nonsense," he says. It seems to me the only conversation in British Columbia today that supports this Premier in his stand is in the home of Mrs. Barrett when she says, "Isn't it funny everybody's out of step but our Davie."

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, there are two things I wish to say. First of all on the Plateau Mills story: the *Vancouver Province* sent a reporter down to interview the former president of the company, and in a very responsible manner reported what the president said. The president who was involved in the negotiation denied the *Vancouver Province*. They sent a reporter down to talk to the principals before *The Vancouver Sun* ran its headlines saying: "Terror Tactics." The question was put by the reporter, one Alec Young as I recall: "Were there terror tactics used?" The answer was no.

I did not see a front-page headline in *The Vancouver Sun* saying "Terror Tactics Not Used," although I would have expected that wording if they wished to correct their story.

Secondly, the Member said that the Garrish report was not made public. Well, since I must go to sources who are not necessarily supporters of the government, I refer the Madam Member to *The Vancouver Sun* of October 30, 1972. Two weeks after the Minister of Agriculture was sworn in the Garrish report was released and there was an extensive report in the paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: Smoke screen.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Smoke screen? The point is that the report was available and that Member deliberately tried to leave the impression in the House that it wasn't available. Again, I question the ability of their own order-in-council appointments.

I quote the Minister saying on October 30: "The new NDP Agriculture Minister, Dave Stupich, said in an interview here Friday that the report's findings will form the basis of continuing discussions between officials of his department and the marketing board." October 30, 1972.

I'd like to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a veteran of many political debates in this

House present with us today and in very good health. I'd like to welcome Harold Winch.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to one other matter. I asked the Member to apologize to Mr. Colby; she saw fit not to apologize to Mr. Colby. I think it's ironic that they selected Mr. Colby, who has some 40 years in public service, to attack. Who did he replace? He replaced that well-known choreographer of the former Premier — oh yes, and I say choreographer by deliberate intention — none other than Mr. Ron Worley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Do not baste our Ronnie.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Now, Mr. Chairman, if you want to trade politics for 40 years in the civil service, we'll take Mr. Colby any day.

MR. A.A. NUNWEILER (Fort George): I would like to make a few comments about some of the points raised. Also, I want to add a few more comments on some other topics.

We hear mention made about words used as terror tactics, in talking about somebody who was going to buy an \$8 million sawmill for \$1,000 down payment. That would mean 55 Members in this House could buy 55 sawmills or pulp mills for \$1,000 each. It's a very, very strange way to do business I would think. If that is what you call terror tactics in Plateau Mills or egg marketing boards or Kootenay Forest Products, just how far out of proportion can one get?

The people in the Interior, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, are very, very much concerned. They are very happy to find out that there is today a government interested in the local people getting the opportunity to produce the local products without being denied the right by the monopolies of the lower mainland.

We talk about the Garrish report. There are statements in here that say the Egg Marketing Board did a wonderful job. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that they did a wonderful job for Clearbrook, but he's suggesting it's time they start doing a wonderful job for the people of British Columbia as a whole, not for Clearbrook.

The slickety-slick city-slicker Members for Vancouver-Point Grey or the chicken farmers of the Liberal Party for once and for all are going to have to find out what is going on in the Interior. The people want their right to do things for themselves, not to be

[[Page 853](#)]

denied by the Clearbrook monopoly. If they're on the side of the Clearbrook monopoly so be it, but they should go out and find out what really is going on in the province.

Up in northern British Columbia we've got vast resources and it appears that it is the harvesting ground of the people of British Columbia — the harvesting ground. Up there, people in the north like to be part of this harvesting operation which is producing tremendous revenue for the Province of British Columbia. The people who are going to enjoy the benefits from the revenue should also include the people of northern British Columbia. This is why, Mr. Chairman, we look forward to further improvements in many respects such as the social aspect, the educational aspect, medical-care aspect throughout the entire north.

When we talk about harvesting resources, it takes more than just trees or minerals; it takes energy, transportation and human resources to do these things. Each one of those four things requires some interlocking arrangement in order to make the whole thing work so that we have more than just benefit from resources, so that we've got the people who get the benefit in the region as a whole.

When we think of energy, that's one thing; but transportation regarding railroads is a tremendous problem in the region. As has been mentioned before, we've got two railroads in northern British Columbia: the Canadian National Railway, which is the people's railroad, and the British Columbia Railway which is the people's railroad.

But somehow or other these two people's railroads have difficulty talking to one another.

We've got a situation of shortage of boxcars. Anybody running a railroad has to realize it takes rolling stock to move the traffic. It takes more than executives or a few locomotives; it takes a full complement of rolling stock. This is where planning for industry is just as important as planning for municipalities and so forth. So consequently, we have a real problem in shortage of boxcars.

As a matter of fact, one people's railroad is somehow or other coordinating their operation so that the industries, be it in Mackenzie or be it in Chetwynd, or Quesnel, 100 Mile House, or even across the river in the City of Prince George....

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): You stay out of Cariboo.

MR. NUNWEILER: I'm in this House, Mr. Member, and you're my neighbour; I'm expecting you to somehow or other agree with me. I'm sure you will.

MR. FRASER: Impossible.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver-Howe Sound): You grow rich on those railways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NUNWEILER: The industry is in the position where they have railway tracks in their pulp mills and in their sawmills in this region. Yet they find they have to haul their products across the river or 100 or 200 miles away and load it on the site of another people's railroad.

The question is why? Why is it they say there's a shortage of boxcars? If they've got boxcars to load on their own railroad in Prince George, there can't be a shortage on that point. So somebody is trying to kid somebody else.

Interjections.

MR. NUNWEILER: The cost of hauling the equivalent of one railway car, either across the river or 100 miles — whatever it is — works out to anywhere from \$300 to \$600 per car in addition to the normal freight expenditure on that product.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (Vancouver-Point Grey): Compared to B.C. Rail.

MR. NUNWEILER: We've got one year of documented evidence now in the B.C. Railway report. In one year there was the equivalent of 9,700 cars, which is almost 10,000, transported by highway to the other people's railway, the Canadian National. The cost simply works out to \$3 million to \$6 million more in transportation costs to move those products than it normally would have cost if they were to spot their rolling stock in the appropriate industrial site. That's \$3 million to \$6 million taken out of the economy, in effect out of the people's pockets, just so that a railway is able to get the full freight complement out of that product. Freight revenue in those 9,700 cars is \$3.4 million. So Canadian National has incurred a \$3 million to \$6 million extra cost on people in the region just so they can reap this extra \$3.4 million for their own operation.

MR. FRASER: Right on.

MR. NUNWEILER: I don't think that Minister of Transport Marchand is really aware of this. We did have Senator Perreault in the area once and he acknowledged the problem. Mind you, he thought he'd solved it, but he found out later, of course, that the 1,000 cars he was sending down here we had bought already anyway.

MR. FRASER: Senator Perreault was up there looking for the Liberals.

MR. NUNWEILER: I wish him the best of luck, but after the last couple of days it's going to be harder and harder and harder to find them.

MR. FRASER: It's easier to find boxcars than it is to find Liberals in that country.

MR. NUNWEILER: Mr. Chairman, people in that region no longer want to be treated as second-class citizens. They don't want to be treated as a second-class region, whether it is for boxcars, whether it's for eggs, or whether it's for any other consumer product. They don't want to be second-class citizens.

All the people in the Interior and we up there congratulate the government, to give some hope that something is going to be done about these things — and all quit talking and talking and talking and never getting anywhere.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that I hear so many stories. One of my voters up there.... Good heavens, I have more than one voter; I have another 8,400 voters, and we've got all kinds of things that we're going to have to do as a government for the whole region of the Interior, not just for the people in Point Grey or in Clearbrook or anybody else. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get back to the issue. I don't know how many times we have to point out to the government, Mr. Chairman, what the issues really are. They don't have anything to do with the Garrish report, nor the prostitution of that report in its presentation to the House the other day.

The issue once again, and I guess we'll just keep repeating it until the government understands....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the Hon. Member would agree that the use of a word such as "prostitution" is unparliamentary language, and I would ask him to choose a more suitable word.

MR. McCLELLAND: What is your authority, Mr. Chairman? Is that one of the words that's been on the list? I haven't seen it. Where is it written?

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. McCLELLAND: Perhaps we should have a public list to hang on the wall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the use of the word is in the imputation that lies behind the word rather than the word itself.

MR. McCLELLAND: I'll withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Would the Hon. Member for Langley continue? There is no point of order. Would the Hon. Member continue? I'll accept his withdrawal.

MR. McCLELLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue in this whole matter once again is government by responsible action versus government by brass knuckles. The issue is integrity in government; the issue is simply one of truth.

It's very disturbing to me, Mr. Chairman, that we've seen once again in this House a Member forced to withdraw from this chamber because the government has refused to face up to the truth, because the government refused to accept the earnest pleas for a public inquiry into a matter of very urgent public interest. That's why this Member was forced to withdraw and for no other reason. The government must face up to the truth.

Mr. Chairman, the people in question who have signed these affidavits have convinced the people of British Columbia that they're telling the truth. They've convinced everyone in this province that it's the Premier and Minister of Finance who is not facing the issues. They've convinced the people of British Columbia that they are responsible

and truthful people. All we ask is that the Premier of this House take the next logical step and allow the kind of full and honest public inquiry we've been asking for in this House for a number of days to take place.

Mr. Chairman, if the Premier and Minister of Finance won't take the advice of the Members of the opposition, then I ask him to take the advice of one of his own Members, because I think the Premier was absent from the House when this was brought up before.

The Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) himself has said, not within the protection of this House, Mr. Chairman, but outside in the public in a public newspaper report in regard to the whole question of marketing boards — and I quote from his newspaper report; the Member for Shuswap has said, "Somewhere between the Minister of Agriculture and the representatives from the government attending that meeting" — he was referring to a meeting of the B.C. Broiler Marketing Board in Vernon, British Columbia — "Somewhere between the Minister and the representatives from government attending that meeting there are lies and contradictions."

Lies, Mr. Chairman — and that not from a Member of the opposition, but from the Member for Shuswap, a Member of this government. It's strong evidence that there's a need for a full public inquiry immediately into this whole matter, and that there was no need for that Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) to be forced to withdraw from this House because of his principles.

I want to ask what's going to happen next. We

[[Page 855](#)]

can't leave this issue standing where it is at the moment; something more has to be done.

I'd like to refer to *Hansard* of Monday, November 5, 1973, when a similar matter was before this House and the Hon. Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) insisted that this matter be dealt with forthwith.

The Attorney-General at that time said that he would appoint and nominate forthwith without notice a committee of privilege to deal with the statements made in the House by the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) against the Hon. Robert Strachan, and that

...the said committee shall with all speed inquire into the said allegations and report its recommendations thereon to this assembly before the end of this session; the said committee of selection to be composed of...

...and the Members were named.

There's no need for a Member to have to stand in this House and raise this kind of an issue as a matter of privilege because the Speaker made it very clear at that time that that wasn't necessary. The Speaker said that he would treat this matter as a breach of privilege regardless of the fact that a Member had refused to withdraw a statement that was unparliamentary.

I'm quoting from *Hansard* again, Mr. Chairman:

It's not for me, as Speaker, to determine the facts of the matter, but only the refusal of a Member to withdraw. But it is my duty to determine whether what was said amounts to a breach of privilege. I indicated this afternoon that it did, in my view — in my opinion, you understand — constitute a matter of privilege that should be inquired into. It follows that the motion therefore would be in order without notice, once I'd made that determination, providing that the motion is in proper form.

Mr. Chairman, that's evidence once again, in this matter which has been raised in this House today because of the ruling that the Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) withdraw — strong evidence — that we can't leave it sit there; something more urgent must be done.

I'm not suggesting to the House what should be done; I'm only suggesting that something had better be done, and done quickly, to deal with this matter.

I would suggest that a committee of privilege be set up immediately and that the Premier go one step further and once and for all withdraw the cloud of suspicion that's hanging all over the Province of British Columbia by announcing to this House that he will set up a committee of inquiry — and do it now.

Why not take that extra step, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Chairman? I would like to move at this time that the committee rise and report progress so that the House could be reconvened and that this whole matter should be gone into with regard to the matter of privilege that was raised earlier today.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 16

Chabot	Bennett	Smith
Jordan	Fraser	Phillips
Richter	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder	McGeer	Williams, L.A.
Gardom	Gibson	Wallace
Curtis		

NAYS — 36

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Hartley	Calder
Nunweiler	Brown	Sanford
D'Arcy	Cummings	Levi
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Lea	Young
Radford	Lauk	Nicolson
Skelly	Gabelmann	Lockstead
Gorst	Rolston	Anderson, G.H.
Barnes	Steves	Kelly
Webster	Lewis	Liden

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, I was afraid that you had developed a blind spot for this corner of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to focus if I may once more on what is the central issue at stake here and the very few key facts surrounding that central issue. To me it's a matter of deep regret that you, sir, have to report to the Speaker, and the Speaker, under our standing orders, must take action against a Member (Mr. D.A. Anderson) of this House whose only transgression is that of telling the truth. There is no question that truth in government is the issue and that the Premier, the Ministers of the Crown and the government backbenchers have refused to acknowledge or accept that they are on trial in this House and before the court of public opinion in British Columbia.

Originally, when we read the affidavit of William Henry Lawrence Brunson to this House, we asked the Minister of Agriculture a series of direct questions stemming from the individual points in that affidavit which numbered 36. Mr. Chairman, the Minister could not recall, and he stated before this House that he wished not to recall, that particular meeting.

He had an opportunity to clear the Premier's name. He had an opportunity to verify the statements in that

affidavit by talking to the man who sat next to him in a chair and who was present at that meeting. Instead, he stood up and advised — if you take it one way — or ordered — if you take it

[[Page 856](#)]

another — that that civil servant and other civil servants present at that meeting keep to themselves what took place in the Premier's office.

[Mr. Liden in the chair.]

Mr. Chairman, we've heard the Premier's version of that day: how he acted as a marriage counselor. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the affidavit which lies before us in this House clearly states that the Premier did order....

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Are you accusing him of lying?

MR. McGEER: You quite understand, Mr. Attorney-General, what we're accusing the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of doing. It's what the affidavit says he has been doing: failing to tell the truth.

The Premier has given a vague account of that day. He had told us that he didn't apply pressure. But then he reads to us a report, which I presume was read today and released the day after that meeting in his office, recommending, if you interpret it the way the Premier chose to do, that pressure be applied. On the other hand he has told us flatly that he did not apply pressure, and on the other hand he uses a report in his defence and interprets to us that he only did what the report recommended, which was to apply pressure. That in itself is a direct contradiction that's been laid before us just in the last two days.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like you, sir, and the other Members of the House, to consider the discrepancy we have had just in the past two days with one other point in the affidavit, which I personally consider to be the key point in this whole issue. Point No. 15: "THAT I was informed by the Premier in the following words that: 'If anything is said outside of this office I will deny every word I said'..."

No one could make a statement like that and forget he had made it. No one could make a statement like that without very seriously considering the consequences to himself and to others. On the one hand he must have calculated that if they were to talk outside his office he would be in trouble. That's why he said it. Where he miscalculated was in the consequences to him if he was held to account for that statement, not by the members who were present in that office but by the people of British Columbia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier has not denied that he said that directly. If he failed to say that, and if this affidavit is false, I want him to deny directly that he said that today in this House, because that is the key statement. A calculated threat. A promise, if you like, but one which, according to the affidavit, he has kept.

The veracity and the conduct of the Premier in the Premier's office are at issue here today. The Premier was new in office at the time this meeting was held. I'm certain the public would have forgiven him this transgression had he stepped forward a year-and-a-half later and said: "Yes, I said that. I was wrong and I am sorry."

We are all human. We all make mistakes. No one who sits in the Premier's office is going to sit there very long without making mistakes. But the test, Mr. Chairman, is how you face those mistakes. It's still the test, Mr. Chairman.

The Second Member for Victoria, the Liberal leader (Mr. D.A. Anderson), was telling the truth. The Premier has slithered past this point. We aren't happy but we can accept a man in office who makes mistakes, even if they are gross ones. What we cannot accept, Mr. Chairman, is somebody who is sitting in the Premier's office who hasn't got the courage to live up to his mistakes and admit them. There is only one office of Premier in this land and that office has to be held high before everybody.

I would ask the Premier a direct question. Mr. Chairman, I also plead with him to save the prestige of his

office, to stand up and admit his mistakes.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Oh, come on! You won't take his word.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: A year ago, for cheap political purposes, I was accused of a certain misdemeanor in this House just because someone in this House happened to be running for the leadership and had to get his name in the paper. That was what it was all about — cheap politics. I won't put the exact value on the politics but it was cheap politics and the Member knew it. Everybody in this House knew it! But we referred it to a legislative committee and then what happened? They said: "Oh, it was partisan politics!" The Leader of the Opposition just the other day — Monday of this week — talked about a "weighted committee," weighted in favour of the government, and he asked for it again the other day.

MR. McCLELLAND: Tell us what the vote was!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: So it doesn't matter what happens — you are not going to accept it. You are going to reject it as you did the finding of the committee last year. It's obvious that this is just part of a blunderbuss vilification programme that the whole opposition are embarked on together with the hotlines, the commentators and the people who are sorry this government was elected. It's part of a blunderbuss vilification — an attempt to destroy the parliamentary system. That's what you are trying to do!

[[Page 857](#)]

MR. PHILLIPS: Poor little government! Poor little boy!

HON. MR. STRACHAN: You know, I used to ask for a judicial inquiry about every second session. But never have I seen the blunderbuss vilification which is part of a concerted effort aided and abetted by the commentators and the hotliners — and we know whose side they're on. That's what this is all about — smears, bluff and cheap politics!

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver-Point Grey): Who is Mr. Brunsdon vilifying?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Accusatory motions, dragging in civil servants who have been with this government for 30 and 35 years — the whole gamut. Motions against this, motions against that, motions against this one, motions against that one — it's probably the most mucky opposition we have ever had in this province, bar none!

I want to tell you that I stand right behind the Premier of British Columbia.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): I have tried to follow this debate and take an objective appraisal of the evidence and opinions that have been expressed to the House. In an earlier speech, although I stated that in my opinion the Premier had interfered, at that point in time it was just a question of political interference which I considered to be the issue. I tried to be practical enough to realize that this kind of interference goes on as part of the fabric of political life, but the issue has become something different.

I don't think the smokescreen which we have just seen put up by the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) does anything to add to the quality of this debate.

The fact is that the issue has been raised as to whether or not the Premier lied. At this point in time I don't know whether the Premier lied. Nobody knows other than the claim that four people say he did. The fact is, and it's been said many ways and many times, that the whole fabric of the parliamentary system, the trust of all the people of the province in government and leaders — no matter what government, no matter what leader — is so fundamental to the survival of our democratic system that I have to come to the reluctant conclusion that the Premier should take action to clear his name.

A Member in this House has stood here on the floor and accused the Premier of lying. As I say, I don't know

whether he did or did not, Mr. Chairman. But I say that if I were in the Premier's shoes and I were innocent, I could not sit still and listen to this kind of accusation without taking some personal action at my discretion — in this case the Premier's discretion — to prove that in fact what he, sitting in his seat today, believes to be the truth is clearly and unequivocally demonstrated in some fashion or another to be the truth.

We can't, with respect, Mr. Chairman, even question the motivation of the accusation. The Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) said this is the basest, cheap political motive that is behind the accusation, and the Minister could be correct. The Premier could be correct in saying that he did not lie. But a fundamental fact for the people of British Columbia is that a very serious charge has been laid by a Member of this House, who, if he is proven to be wrong, must resign his seat in this House.

We all know that to make a charge of this severity against any Member — the lowest backbencher or the Premier of the government — carries the clear understanding that to make such a serious charge carries the same penalty for the accuser if it is proven to be unfounded.

Whether the Minister of Transport and Communications is correct or not in his own interpretation of the incident in which he was involved, there is this procedure. The Premier has often stated how he respects the parliamentary system and the democratic rules under which we function, and in the case of the Minister of Transport and Communications that parliamentary procedure followed its course and a Committee of Privilege was held.

As I say, it is not even as important to understand any motivation that might be behind the committee so much as to open up the whole issue under consideration to the fullest opportunity on both sides to prove whether or not a man in a very responsible position of government lied.

The precedents are there from the mother of parliament for hundreds of years. At this point in time I think we also know — and the Premier knows from his experience on radio this morning — the comments of many concerned members of the public in British Columbia. Whether or not a lie has been told, the question is the people of British Columbia know the issue has been raised. I heard one lady say how little it mattered to her that this particular argument consisted of a debate over chickens and eggs. What she said was "Mr. Premier, how do we know about your word on the bigger issues?"

There are many bigger issues in the province now and unquestionably in the future. In the light of such a blatant accusation this afternoon and the fact that another Member has chosen to make the accusation and put his own seat on the line, even if the Premier is innocent and if he knows he's innocent and he's convinced he is innocent, the correct and proper thing to do is to hold some form of inquiry at which the Premier can demonstrate unquestionably that his position is sound. Above all, by proving his position is

[[Page 858](#)]

sound, throughout the rest of his administration in this province his word will be taken to be what we have always taken it to be: completely honest, reliable and unequivocal.

I say this with great reluctance, Mr. Premier, to you through the Chair: if some such action is not taken by you, it is my feeling from listening to radio and talking to the public that your own credibility, your own ability and capacity to function as the leader of this province at such a crucial time in the history of the province will be very seriously damaged if the situation is left exactly as it is.

The Premier has said that he has made his statement and the accusers made their statements. He knows he is innocent, and that's where the matter rests. With the greatest respect, I have to say that individuals in society cannot be satisfied with that sort of situation. The general tenor of the comments on the radio programme this morning seem to follow that path. This matter must be put to the test by one vehicle or another, by a judicial inquiry, or by a committee on privilege. It is certainly a very serious charge; the most serious charge that can be leveled against any one of us in this House.

As the record shows, I, speaking for the Conservative Party, had felt that up until the point that such a blatant

accusation was actually made in this House the Premier could choose to answer the issue in the way he has been doing. But as one of the Members behind me says, the corner has been turned. But today a responsible Member of this House and, as it happens, a leader of one of the parties made a blunt accusation of the Premier. For the evidence to be that the Premier is not planning to take any action to clear his name in the face of such a serious accusation is something that disturbs me considerably.

I know the Premier respects the parliamentary system and the democratic principles that are followed. We've had examples in Britain of Members who said something less than the truth and who were later committed to the honourable action of resigning. We needn't mention names; we know whom we're talking about. I also have that respect for the fact that each one of us in this House is on his honour. When he makes a statement, as the chairman and the Speaker so frequently remind us, each and every one of us accepts that statement.

Now, we have a situation where a Member of the House has refused to accept the word of the Premier and has been ejected from the House. I think we have to recognize that the accusers in the first instance have put their names to statements. The Attorney-General looks up and he's ready to interfere....

HON. MR. MACDONALD: It's based on recollections after a year-and-a-half of a short meeting....

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Oak Bay has the floor. Order, the Member for Oak Bay is speaking.

Interjections.

MR. WALLACE: There has been a great deal of mention that this was a recollection of a conversation 18 months ago. But even if one ignores a very great part of these affidavits, there is one statement which distresses me very greatly. That a citizen would sign his name in affidavit form and say to the effect.... I haven't got the affidavit in front of me but we all know the quotation that has been mentioned many times in debate: "If anything is said outside this room, I will deny everything." I don't think I would forget after 18 years, never mind 18 months, if I had a confidential conversation with somebody and the parting shot from the other party was that if I ever said anything outside these four walls he would deny everything. Again, regardless of whether you're talking about chickens or eggs or the future of Canada, I think it's a little difficult to convince anyone that an individual would make such an accusation in affidavit form if he didn't clearly remember that that was said.

I think it's a very sad day in this House that we should have to be debating such a crucial matter, namely an accusation against the Premier of this province of lying. I have tried throughout the last week or 10 days to listen to both sides of the argument. My only conclusion today, in the light of the Premier's feeling that the matter can be left where it is, leaves me no alternative but to speak in the terms I've done. In this last moment, I hope the Premier will still reconsider.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I rise to reply more out of respect for the personal relationship I have with that Member, although we do not share the same philosophy. He and I have shared many private conversations over the years.

I want to say first of all that the Member (Mr. D.A. Anderson) who left the House today made a significant statement. He said "the accuracy of impression" — the first time he has alluded to that particular phrase. I think it's significant that he chose it carefully today. Then he wanted to make a decision on the accuracy of impression, between the accuracy of my impressions and the accuracy of someone else's impressions.

It is true, Mr. Member, that traditionally in this House you take the word of another Member. I have stated very openly and very candidly on many occasions — sometimes politically to the disadvantage of my party — my position, my attitudes, my feelings and my responses. Some people say I am intemperate

in that regard, and perhaps they're right.

This particular meeting took place 18 months ago. It was certainly called at my instigation, along with the Minister of Agriculture, to deal with the report as excerpts have been read.

It is true I was harsh with them by describing them as acting like children, but I meant it. And, frankly, I mean it today because in fact that problem is still being dealt with in anger, with frustration and, as of the news yesterday, counter-affidavits against members of the board — a counter-affidavit attacking the executive secretary of the board as threatening someone to withhold feed from a producer.

Mr. Chairman, through you, there is a history with that board, with the former administration, of personal intensity, of statements made and statements denied. If I were to look back on it and reflect, I would have avoided the marriage-counseling role. But, nonetheless, I was there and I assumed that role.

I have said exactly, in terms of the reference given today, my impressions of that meeting. What I said today is a continuation of what I said before. I don't know how many times I have to say it. But I say again that the statements I made earlier, and again on the radio station this morning, stand.

I cannot believe that there is any political motivation in terms of your request, although I have my doubts when the request comes from other sources. But I tell you, Mr. Member, I've thought about this a great deal, especially last night, and I have decided that absolutely nothing would be served by a legislative committee, or by a judicial inquiry, other than having people come and repeat the same statements that have been said over a period of time, coming to the same conclusions.

Do you believe one side of statements, or do you believe the other? That is really the crux. That is where everybody has to make a decision.

MR. GARDOM: You're under oath there.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Well, Mr. Member, every time I speak in this House I consider I am under oath. That's the oath I took with my office on coming to this House.

Mr. Chairman, there is no fuller opportunity for discussing the matter than right here. This is a public inquiry. That is the whole purpose of the legislative session.

Interjections.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Member, through you, I know that no matter what is said certain Members are not going to be satisfied. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the same statements will be made in one form that are made in another.

What does it really come down to? The decision comes down to whether or not you wish to believe my statements or someone else's. Now, I'm suggesting to you that in the final analysis that's exactly what it is.

My statements stand, and I ask you to make your decision. That is where the matter rests. And the people of British Columbia will also have to make their own decision. So that is where the matter rests, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GARDOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, still the fundamental question that is before everybody is as to whether the Hon. Premier has acted beyond or has not acted beyond the powers of the *Natural Products Marketing (British Columbia) Act* and beyond the propriety of his office. That is the main question.

If the affidavit of Mr. Brunsdon and the affidavit of Mr. Unger are to be believed, the Premier has acted beyond the powers given under the *Natural Products Marketing (British Columbia) Act*, and very clearly beyond the propriety of his office.

What has happened affects the good government of this province. That is why it was suggested at this seat by

myself that we should have a public inquiry under the *Public Inquiries Act* where there would be an opportunity for an independent commissioner, the matter would be taken totally out of the political arena, and witnesses would be called — and that would be including you, Mr. Premier, because you would be under subpoena, and you would have to give your evidence under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. That is what we are not receiving in this Legislature, and we are not receiving answers to questions, Mr. Premier. In a public inquiry it would be incumbent upon every witness to answer questions, and that is not what is happening here.

If you feel that you have been wronged by Mr. Brunson, and if you feel that you have been wronged by Mr. Unger, why, indeed, do you not take proceedings against them? If they are lying they should be held to account. Make no mistake about that — and I am glad the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) is making some notes of that statement.

Furthermore, if you think that you have been wronged by them and they are not telling the truth, you have, apart from your personal responsibility, the responsibility of your office to see that they, too, can come here before the bar of this House and state their own case the way it was given in affidavit and be subject to questions from all sides of the House, yourself included, and you are certainly entitled to ask them any degree of questions you wish to.

This afternoon in the hall, Mr. Premier, shortly after the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. D.A. Anderson) was ordered to leave the House, you said to the press that you stated exactly what your

[[Page 860](#)]

impression was. You remember, and you agree with me. The Hon. Premier agrees with that. He said: "I stated exactly what my impression was."

Well, I'll tell you what your exact statements of impression consist of. In this whole matter they consist of pretty well only two things. There was trouble with the marketing board — that's accepted fact by everybody. And you said they were acting like children. It certainly seems that they were having all sorts of difficulties between themselves, between their producers. Whether or not they were acting like children — that might have been an extravagant statement, but probably quite correct. You said that you asked the two of them to get together. And you agree with that.

Now this boils down to your exact statement of impression. I say what a miserable example of exactitude. You find a little more exactitude in the statement of Mr. Brunson.

MR. LEWIS: Shame!

MR. GARDOM: For example, he remembers there was a meeting, and he can say everybody who was at it. You did agree with me in the House a few days ago that there was a meeting, that you were present, and that the meeting was during the daytime. That was as far as you would go with the particulars of that meeting.

I asked you whether or not you were sitting in front of your desk or leaning in front of your desk speaking to these members of these boards who were sitting on a settee in your office in front of your desk, 10 feet away, and you didn't answer that.

I also asked you whether the Minister of Agriculture was on your right, so he would obviously be within earshot, unless the poor fellow needs an ear trumpet. You didn't answer that either.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: How could anybody remember that after a year-and-a-half?

MR. GARDOM: Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Attorney-General. You asked me a perfectly valid question. When you are saying "anybody," are you referring to the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture? I'll take them one by one.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Especially the Premier. He's probably had 2,500 meetings in his office.

MR. GARDOM: All right. He's had a lot of meetings, and he's been a busy man. I'll tell you why, Mr.

Attorney-General, this would be vivid in the recollection of the Hon. Premier, Mr. Chairman.

It would be vivid because this was the very first time this Egg Marketing Board thing started to spill over the top. Kovachich was grossly upset. He was facing a \$21,000 legitimate legal levy and he ended up with a \$7,500 legal levy. He was a strong supporter of the Member for Fort George (Mr. Nunweiler) over here. He was a strong NDPer. He certainly got favourable treatment.

You can't tell me that the first time the Premier of the province, after he'd been elected, knowing his problems with the marketing boards, knowing in his view that they were acting like children — he had all of them in front of him — forgets that he says to Mr. Brunson that he would deny everything when he got out of his office. If you're going to suggest to me that he wouldn't remember that, that's hogwash!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDOM: Absolute hogwash!

Here's some of the exactitude on the other side. Here's some of the exactitude. You got the exactitude by the affidavit of Mr. Brunson. I'm not going to go through this again, but his statements are very dramatically laid down. They're in quotation. "There will be no court case against Mr. Sy Kovachich," said Mr. Barrett. Did you or did you not say that, or don't you remember?

Now, you've got an alternative there. You say, fine, there's no need for an inquiry. You're answering questions in here. This is the highest court of the land. I agree with you. This is the highest court of the land, but you're not answering questions.

"There will be no court case against Sy Kovachich." Did you say it? Didn't you say it? Or don't you remember? Or did you say something differently?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: It wasn't on tape.

MR. GARDOM: It's too bad it wasn't, I guess, eh? I don't know.

You further said to the board, who were sitting on the settee in front of you, and you're the Premier of the province, that the charges against Kovachich must be substantially reduced and if they're not reduced you're going to break them. Well, really and truly, you're the chief executive officer of the Province of British Columbia. You've just come to power. You've got an enormous mandate here. What you say pretty well goes in this province until the next general election, and you don't think that these fellows won't remember that. I don't think for one moment that you didn't make that statement, Mr. Premier. No way!

And then this "kicking" suggestion. Well, that to me sounds just a little like vintage Barrett. It really does. That does sound like you, you know. It does sound like you. If you didn't quite use those words, you might have used something else. But that does sound like vintage Barrett. No question of a doubt

[[Page 861](#)]

about that.

But you can always ask the leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Wallace). He said: "If anyone said 'if anything is said outside this office, I'll deny every word I said,' I'll tell you that would be very, very vivid in my recollection."

So are you saying today that you don't remember saying it? Are you denying saying it? Or are you admitting saying it? You've really only got one of the three courses. It seems very odd to me that the Minister of Agriculture.... You see, here again is a statement of exactitude in this affidavit. I'm not going to read the affidavit of Mr. Unger, but there are similar statements of exactitude. Mr. Unger's affidavit corroborates Mr. Brunson's.

Now, this meeting took about 45 minutes, so we've got another corroborative fact. They were there. There was a meeting. We know there was a meeting. The things are starting to fall into place. The crossword puzzle is starting to fall into place.

Now, you said yourself, as did the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich), that this was an emotional situation. It was, and it was obviously a very, very emotional situation. It was emotional for a lot of reasons.

Kovachich has \$21,000 worth of claim against him. You have decided the marketing boards are acting like children. They are all there in front of you and you are going to hammer out an agreement. I'll say it was an emotional situation!

These fellows were at the end of the stick, and they were watching you, and they received the full force of your emotion, which can be considerable. Witness what happens in this House. When you give a great speech in this House the rafters ring. You've got the capacity for emotion — make no mistake of that.

You know why I'm saying this? Because the fact that it was an emotional situation illustrates — clearly illustrates — that this would remain indelibly in the memory of these people; and it's done that. It has remained indelibly in the minds of Mr. Brunsdon and in the mind of Mr. Unger.

Now another exactitude: we have something on oath. Legally you don't have to take any affidavits or statutory declarations, I know that. I say that ethically you would have to in this case, but that's up to you to make that decision. But the fact that these people are prepared to go ahead and put it on oath again is an example of exactitude.

You say: "I stated exactly what my impression was...acting like children...asking them to get together and have a meeting." That's as far as you go. They sure go a lot farther than you do.

Now another illustration of exactitude is your own Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich). He was at the meeting; he agreed to that. He agreed to the meeting, he wanted the meeting and he was certainly at the meeting. And he never denied — this is very significant, Mr. Premier — the Minister of Agriculture never denied your "crap-kicking" words. He said, "I didn't hear them."

He never denied you saying to Mr. Unger that you'd deny everything that was ever repeated out of your office. The Minister of Agriculture refused to back you up and deny that you said those things. All he said was that, "I didn't hear them." That's all he said: "I didn't hear them." Okay, there's a big difference in that from a denial. There's a big difference in that from a denial.

And here is another statement of exactitude: what Mr. Kovachich wanted Mr. Kovachich got — yessirree! There is no evidence before this Legislature, before the board, before anybody today, that Mr. Kovachich received an illegal assessment or an improper assessment. Mr. Kovachich apparently received a legal assessment and a proper assessment.

For one reason or another an arbitrary figure, which ended up being 50 per cent to 33 1/3 per cent, of the settlement came in his favour. Okay. Well, that again is some indication of items of exactitudes.

But the point is, Mr. Premier, that you have a responsibility, in my view. First of all, I'd far prefer that you cleanse the thing, that you get it totally, 100 per cent out of the political arena and put it into a public inquiry under an independent commissioner.

It's your own trial. You're refusing really to have your own trial. There the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth could be told, because it cannot be told here, Mr. Premier. It is not happening in this assembly.

I mentioned to you, and I'm going to mention it again, because I really, thoroughly respect it and still do — like your statements during the unfortunate Calder incident.... You took the position with the Hon. Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) that he had not told you the whole truth.

As a result of that, without any affidavits, without any supportive evidence that anyone else knows about, you elected to impose upon Mr. Calder the highest fine that can be given a cabinet Minister in the Province of British Columbia — a \$21,000 fine without appeal, and he's reduced out of his office. And you did that on that evidence. The evidence against you is stronger.

I'm not saying that you should not have the opportunity to refute it. I'm saying that you should have a proper opportunity to refute it. You're not giving yourself the chance to do that; that, unfortunately, is the worst, the very baddest thing about this because you recognized the responsibility and the duties of the Ministers of your cabinet in the Calder affair.

You said that there's a higher degree of responsibility upon a Member of the cabinet in the Province of British Columbia than any other Member. Would you apply the same test here? That's what

[[Page 862](#)]

we're asking.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Well, I don't want to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition, but I just want to make a couple of general statements because I think the Hon. Member who just took his seat said, "Why not do something about the people who swore the affidavits?"

Now legally it isn't just a question of whether somebody has a false affidavit or a true affidavit, in one particular or another.

Interjection.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, no it isn't just that. It is whether they knowingly swore a false affidavit.

MR. GARDOM: You're talking about perjury now.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: That's right. There are the two ingredients — right — false in some particular, and knowingly false at the time of swearing. Now I'm not deciding the issue. If somebody presents evidence to my office, then it should be treated like any other case. But I do point out that the second ingredient would be a very difficult ingredient — not referring to this particular case — based upon somebody's genuine recollection of what happened a year-and-a-half before.

It would be particularly difficult also if the affidavit did not report exactly what was said, but said "similar words to the same effect."

MR. GARDOM: Mr. Attorney-General, most affidavits are tested in cross-examination, aren't they?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) said "precedence in parliament" and so forth. I rather doubt if any parliament has attempted to resurrect the brief words of a meeting which were oral — there would be no tapes like there might have been in some parts of the world, which would be a most deplorable practice — a year-and-a-half before. The exact words!

The difference is kind of narrow, you know between... what we're all talking about today. The Premier laid a heavy message before the Egg Marketing Board, I gather. I wasn't there.

MR. GARDOM: That's right.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And it's a message that ought to have been laid. I think there are some people that think it should have been stronger; but leave that aside.

The Premier has told this House that he didn't order or direct. Admittedly he explained what public policy was, I suppose, in some kind of words that were pretty emphatic. But he said, "I didn't order or direct."

Now when you think about the "order or direct" I ask you to bear this in mind. He couldn't order or direct an independent board.

He could recommend to cabinet that the order-in-council be changed. That would be a legitimate thing. He could disapprove a particular marketing scheme which has to be approved by a cabinet. But he couldn't really order and direct the board.

Interjection.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, well, that's his statement to this House. Neither could he order or direct, and the board must have known that he can't order or direct. He knew he couldn't; they knew he couldn't. They went away and made some kind of a settlement with lawyers on both sides. Nothing wrong with that. And they presumably reached their own conclusions on the matter after they left the Premier's office because — and I think this is important — they didn't protest.

I haven't read these affidavits in great detail, but I don't think....

Interjections.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Okay, I've listened to them over five days. If you want me to read them send them to my office. Okay. I have no objection to reading affidavits; that's the kind of job I'm in, and I'll read them in detail if you like.

But I'm not arguing this word-for-word thing. I am saying it is significant that the people whose independence of decision was supposedly abused by the Premier — and that he gave them an order of direction — didn't make a protest at that time or, as far as I know, till about a year-and-a-half later. I think that's significant; I really do.

It's all very well to talk about legislative inquiries, but you people on the other side of the House have made about sixteen-and-a-half very serious charges without any evidence in the last 10 days — okay? Shall we have an inquiry in all of them? Shall we desert the public business of the province, on the building of a better province, to be diverted by inquiries into everything that you raise? Oh, come on, let's get on with building this province.

There are real issues of public policy in what the Premier has under his control and his charge, and they haven't been debated in his estimates.

Interjection.

[[Page 863](#)]

HON. MR. MACDONALD: You are a negative opposition. I started my remarks with the determined conviction that they wouldn't be partisan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And I missed the boat somewhere along.

I really don't think though, Mr. Chairman, that that kind of inquiry can really re-establish the exact words said in a quick meeting. When I said there might have been 2,500 meetings in the Premier's office since that time, I think I'm being conservative. You've got no idea. I managed to get a meeting with him — when was it? In November of 1972. It was a 10 minute meeting and it was a lively one.

Interjection.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Yes, that's right; we had to go to lunch. But, really, there are a great many meetings in the Premier's office because he tries to take an interest in all of the departments of government. The

problems are not just the Egg Marketing Board; they're in many, many directions.

Interjections.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I don't think any kind of inquiry could bring back to earth the exact words spoken at some of those meetings a year and a half ago, I really don't.

Anyway, I really rose to make that general comment about the affidavit. There wouldn't be any proof that these people knowingly swore a false affidavit. I doubt that.

Interjection.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No, I'm not dismissing the thing out of hand. If there was evidence of that, okay. I think that's their best recollection and probably bona fide, and it could be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: It could be libelous, too.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: So that's all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman. I for one accept the Premier's word that he didn't direct or order the board to do something, and I basically do it because I believe him. Secondly, he couldn't order or direct them. Thirdly, they knew he couldn't order or direct them.

MR. W.R. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, it's obvious to us all in this committee that the estimates are completely bogged down and the discussion underway cannot be solved by the Committee of Supply. We have affidavits and counter-affidavits. We have the very serious question of the leader of the Liberal Party, the Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson), expelled from the House. These questions cannot be dealt with in Committee of Supply. We have the request for a public inquiry into the affidavits and the reply of the Premier. We have the Premier's own suggestion a few minutes ago that the House could be a court and that witnesses could be brought before the bar of this House.

For these reasons, I therefore move the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Interjections.

MR. BENNETT: That's right, and these estimates are bogged down, Mr. Attorney-General, and the situation being discussed can only be dealt with by a committee of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your motion is out of order. You can't move that motion twice in one sitting.

MR. BENNETT: I didn't move it before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was moved earlier.

Interjections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your motion is out of order.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: It's unfortunate that we have this long debate. I think, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just said, the Committee of Supply is inappropriate to resolve this conflict. I'm sorry the Hon. Attorney-General, the chief law officer of the Crown, the government's lawyer...

Interjection.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: How unfortunate it is. I made a note of some of the things he said in his sterling defence of the Premier and his belief that the Premier is telling the truth. It reminds me of the former Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Mr. Gaglardi) who said: "I never lie because everything I say I think is true." I remember when the Hon. Attorney-General was in opposition how he roared when Mr. Gaglardi made that

statement.

But he also said in the course of his remarks: "I don't think the words can be brought back after 18 months. I doubt that the inquiry could produce any resolution," or words to that effect. But you see, Mr. Chairman, this is the problem. It isn't what the Attorney-General thinks and it isn't the Attorney-General's doubts that we have to concern ourselves with. It's whether or not someone

[[Page 864](#)]

independent of any partisan political position would listen to what the Premier and others who attended that meeting had to say about that meeting, and what decision that commissioner on the inquiry would come to.

That's the only way you're going to clear the air, Mr. Attorney-General, and it's the only way you are going to erase that doubt that's in your mind. If you have a doubt, that means perhaps the commissioner would find that the Premier did lie. If you have a doubt, that doubt can only be resolved by someone who hears the whole testimony of all of the 9 or 11 people who were at the meeting.

It's strange that the Hon. Attorney-General cannot believe that after 18 months people who were there involved in this meeting could have recalled what took place. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) believes that both the Premier and Mr. Brunsdon would certainly have better recollection than his. The Minister of Agriculture thought those people had very good reason to recall what took place at that meeting. It's really startling, Mr. Chairman, at this particular stage.

Interjection.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: The Hon. Attorney-General has just said something very significant: that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is a farmer and Mr. Brunsdon is a farmer. Farmers, Mr. Chairman, take a very simple, clear view of things that occur. They're honest people. They work with the land and they don't have any devious thoughts in their minds. They believe what is said to them and they recall.

Interjection.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: That's right. Well, we can deal with the quotas in a minute. The Hon. Premier dealt with the Garrish report but he didn't read the significant parts, and I shall in a moment.

But for the benefit of the Attorney-General, who hasn't read the affidavits, let me explain to him why this meeting was called. This meeting was called to solve Mr. Sy Kovachich's problem. He had a \$21,000 levy sitting against him by the Egg Marketing Board and a Mr. Samsom had a similar levy. These men went to the Premier through friendly Members to get this problem resolved. That's why the meeting was called.

The Hon. Attorney-General would find, if he read the affidavits carefully, that after being directed by the Premier that the charges against Kovachich be substantially reduced, he was asked by the members of the board who were at the meeting if his order was a precedent which the Egg Marketing Board would have to follow with respect to other producers. He was told by Mr. Barrett: "No, just this one instance." If any other producers get out of line, step on them."

That's what the Premier told the members of the Egg Marketing Board.

MR. CHABOT: The iron heel!

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: The iron heel. Now I would gather, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is having the opportunity now to give some instructions to the Attorney-General. If that is the case, why didn't he remember when he was under questioning in his estimates just a few days ago. He had no recollection and he had no desire to try to recollect. He had a very convenient lapse of memory when he was the only Member in this House who could cast any light upon the problems we're considering today. He couldn't even recall how the meeting

came about. As a matter of fact, on television the other night he had the temerity to suggest that maybe this meeting was called at the request of the Egg Marketing Board.

But the Premier remembers, and the Premier remembers that he discussed the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and they agreed that they would have this meeting. The Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. That's how the meeting came about, but the Minister of Agriculture can't recall. So I trust the Attorney-General is not receiving any information from that "Minister of amnesia." The Minister of amnesia, that's what we have.

Political interference took place in the office of the Premier of British Columbia dealing with the problems of one or two specific egg producers. It was a unique situation and the Premier was forcing the egg board to reduce levies that had been made against those egg producers from \$21,000 down to \$7,500

You wonder why this matter comes before this House and the public of this province 18 months later. I'll tell you why, Mr. Chairman. I just learned this morning. I was on a radio programme and we had a call from a producer of eggs in the Fraser Valley.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: They're the only ones there are.

MR. LA. WILLIAMS: He pointed out that the \$21,000 levy against Mr. Kovachich was not a fine. It was a levy made against that egg producer in the same way as levies are made against all egg producers, based upon the size of their quota. Everybody else paid their levy, but not Sy Kovachich. He refused to pay his levy. This meeting took place and that levy was reduced to \$7,500.

After that levy was reduced to \$7,500, other egg producers in British Columbia kept asking the Egg Marketing Board — how come? And they weren't getting any answers because the members of the Egg Marketing Board were fearful of compromising the directions that they had been given in the office of

[[Page 865](#)]

the Premier of the province.

Fortunately a diligent reporter for *The Province* newspaper — *The Province* being the paper the Premier spoke so highly of this afternoon — found out the story, and he chased down the people who were involved and he got the affidavits. That's why it comes before this House 18 months later. I only wish it could have been known earlier, and then we would have had the matter dealt with at a more propitious moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: With better recollections all round.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: We could have had it dealt with at a time the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture had the so-called Garrish report before them. The Premier referred to this this afternoon, when he referred to a press story in *The Vancouver Sun* indicating that the Garrish report had been made public, and that the Garrish report was in the hands of the Department of Agriculture for action. That's October 30. Mark that date, because October 30, when the Department of Agriculture was dealing with the Garrish report, was four days after the Premier meddled in this affair on behalf of Sy Kovachich.

HON. MR. BARRETT: We had the report before that.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Four days after the Premier stuck his nose in this affair and muddied it up — that's when the Department of Agriculture began to deal with the matter.

HON. MR. BARRETT: That's not so.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: So that's 18 months ago that the Department of Agriculture had this before them for study. And yet, Mr. Chairman, if you look very carefully at the Speech from the Throne that opened this session, there was no promise of action to change the egg marketing scheme and the broiler marketing scheme in the *Natural Products Marketing Act*, although the Minister of Agriculture during the course of his estimates indicated that this

legislation is going to come before us.

This terribly important matter to protect all of the producers in the Interior and on the Island is going to be dealt with at this legislative session. But there's no mention of it in the throne speech. Big secret.

MR. CHABOT: They want to bail out.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: They want to bail out. That's the problem. The Premier of this province uses the Garrish report in his defence. But it's very interesting that he read what was on page 20 of the Garrish report as he did this afternoon. However, it's also significant that he did not read what appears on page 21 of the Garrish report. I will read it:

"It has been the general practice of government, after producer marketing boards have been established, to leave them to run their own affairs. On the whole, this has worked well. It is not a basic right of the marketing boards; on the contrary, any delegation of power by government to any board, no matter how elected or constituted, carries with it an obligation by government to make sure that the delegated powers are not being abused."

It doesn't say in Mr. Garrish's report that there's an obligation on the Premier to deal with these matters on a private, confidential basis in his office and to inter-meddle in the affairs of the board established by order-in-council. It's the responsibility of government, says Mr. Garrish.

He said this in September of 1972. The Premier of the province had the report in September of 1972. He had the report on October 26, when he met privately with board members and others and inter-meddled in the affairs of the board. He knew that the department had the report on October 30, 1972, and was doing something about it. But 18 months later there's been no change in the scheme which these Interior members and Island members would suggest is so vital and which they would point to as the justification for inter-meddling in this matter by the Premier of this province.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the debate on the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, what the Premier has done was not within his authority. What he attempted to do and succeeded in doing with the board was to oblige them to work and deal unlawfully. He has consistently refused to take the advice of Mr. Garrish, which is to have the government make sure that the delegated power of marketing boards is not abused. Rather than take that course of action, what the Premier has done is to abuse the power and authority contained in the legislation and in the order-in-council.

Interjection.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind being accused by that Minister of being a protector of privilege, because the privilege that I protect is the right of the citizens of this province to believe that the Ministers of the Crown and their elected representatives can be trusted to carry out their responsibilities in accordance with the law — honestly, truthfully, and above board. "Open government" is what we have heard from the Premier and from the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) so many times, and yet instead of open

[[Page 866](#)]

government what we have received from the Premier in this particular instance is stealth and private, under-the-table dealing to assist one or two members of the whole community.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You don't believe that yourself.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to all Members of this House, that what has occurred here has cast a cloud over the Premier's office and has given a clear indication to all of the people of this province that if you find yourself in the position of dealing with the Premier on a confidential basis in his office, don't believe what he tells you, because he'll promise to lie.

MR. LEWIS: I kind of feel like a sheep in a wolf pen getting up here among the lawyers.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: A fox in the hen house. (Laughter.)

MR. LEWIS: But at the same time I would like to...

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to call for Stupich's resignation today?

MR. LEWIS: No, no. Maybe yours. I think that the whole story has to go back to greed. Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm going to be accused of being repetitious, but the Members of the opposition have been repetitious for days and days and days.

When I say greed, I mean greed. I would suggest that people who attended that meeting that day also had a little greed in the back of their minds. They were owners of quotas who had some fear of what was going to happen if the Garrish report was implemented.

Interjection.

MR. LEWIS: I'm in the egg marketing business as a producer. I've got a 140 cases of quota.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: What's it worth?

MR. LEWIS: It's worth about \$42,000. That \$42,000 I got for nothing — the same as those people who were in that meeting that day.

MR. McCLELLAND: Give it back. Give it to the Salvation Army.

MR. LEWIS: They got their quota for nothing, too. But all of a sudden they saw dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hundreds of them in your riding.

MR. LEWIS: I don't know what amount of quota the producers have who swore affidavits, but I would suggest that maybe one of them might have had 200 cases. At that time it was valued at \$350 a case, which would have made it worth \$70,000. And for \$70,000 a lot of people will remember a lot of things that may not have happened.

Interjections.

MR. LEWIS: I'm not calling him a liar, but it would be quite convenient to forget what was said or remember what wasn't said.

I'm not saying anyone lied. But I'm saying that the whole problem stems back to greed, both in regard to egg marketing boards and broiler boards.

As I said before, a broiler chicken — the right to grow it — costs you \$3.75 a bird. When you have producers that get up into the 40,000, 50,000 and 60,000 bird bracket, it's not very hard to figure out that they've accumulated quite a bit of wealth for nothing. There are many other workers in this province that have worked 20, 30 or 40 years and when it came time for them to retire, they were not able to sell the right of their job.

I stand very strongly on this. I've got \$42,000 worth of quota. Tomorrow I will wipe it off, if other producers in this province are told to do the same thing, with no regret. Who are the people who are so concerned about it? — poor old Panco, with about 190,000 broilers worth \$3.75 a bird, for which they probably never paid one cent. It's quite a windfall.

Wall & Redekop happen to be in the business too. That's quite surprising, isn't it? They have it broken up into different names, but they all end up with Redekop. I think there are about 1,600 cases of egg quotas in that family.

Go back to poor old Panco too; I think they raise probably about 70 per cent of the turkeys in this province.

I'm not sure what their quota is worth, but I'll guarantee you it's a sizeable sum.

Wall & Redekop I think are also making money in other fields that are questionable. And I say the sale of quota is questionable.

There are all kinds of charges being made in this House. I even had a couple of Members in the House stand up and say that the Member for Shuswap used unwarranted pressure upon the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture.

Well, have you ever seen a poor old farm boy come into this House and be able to put unwarranted pressure on the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture? If this is happening, I say we have a real step forward in government in this province (Laughter.)

[[Page 867](#)]

The Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland) is very concerned, and maybe I'd be concerned too about what's happening to farming in the province and what might happen to poor old Langley. They only have 75 per cent of the egg production in Langley. They only have 90 per cent of the broiler production.

Sure, he has a job; he's got the same job I have. Go into the House and represent your people. He's doing a good job of it. That's what he's hollering about in this House; he's worried it might be diluted.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

MR. LEWIS: You know, it's most amazing that there seems to be so much concern among the Liberal Members that come out of a city. They don't have any Members in the Interior of the province, and I think they have one or two on Vancouver Island, but I'll warrant they're not going to have them in the next election. The producers, the farmers, the consumers and the rest of the province also are concerned about what's happening with marketing boards and what's happening with the right to farm in this province.

I would say in no uncertain terms that the Members representing ridings throughout the Interior, Vancouver Island and the lower mainland had better start to take a look at defending their ridings, defending the right to farm in them.

I just want to touch a little further on the Broiler Marketing Board. I mentioned the other day that there were some people in the Interior — I think it was about four years ago — that wanted to go into broiler production. They started a killing plant in that area, which would have been an asset to the whole area. They went to the broiler board and made the proposition that "We'd like to see some quota come into the Interior, so we can supply part of the consumption in that area."

They applied to the federal government for a grant through the federal incentives programme. The federal government okayed a \$40,000 grant for the construction of that plant. But to show you how much power boards have, they were able to say, "No, you shall not have the right to produce the product in the Interior."

They lost the \$40,000 for the construction of the plant, and agriculture got another kick in the face.

They said: "We can't allow any quota to come into the Interior," in April; "there are too many chickens on the market." In June they gave themselves another 500,000 broilers. Now that's real justice. I say it was time that somebody kicked the crap out of them. If the Premier didn't use those words, he should have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the words.

MR. LEWIS: Okay — manure. Anyway, to carry the story on a little further, I've been objectionable about it. No doubt there are lots of people involved in the broiler production that have got large quotas who would say I was objectionable because I started to holler and say that there should be some production in the Interior.

So after we were elected, a year-and-a-half goes by, and finally there's a decision made that they're going to put 55,000 birds into the Interior — which would have never operated a plant in the first place. Then, being really nice fellows, they turned around and increased their own by 600,000. Now that's a real servant of the people, I'll tell you.

HON. MR. BARRETT: How much is 600,000 worth?

MR. LEWIS: Well, just multiply it by \$3.75. That was permit, but that would have been converted in three years. So that's a sizeable amount of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Member relate his remarks to the Premier's estimates, please?

MR. LEWIS: Yes. This is a lot of money; that's why it's being related to the Premier. (Laughter.)

I think, if I'm right, there's something like \$59 million worth of quota out in the farming industry. You charge a 10 per cent interest on that quota — which most people have to do that have bought it — charge a 10 per cent interest on that quota and then you start to realize why some of the food products seem a little higher than they should be.

I would suggest to this House that it's time we get off this subject; it's time that we start to deal with something that's of importance to the province. I think that the Legislature has got the message. I think they realize there have to be some changes made in marketing boards, and I think it's about time that you support them. Thank you.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a couple of comments.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I bet you do.

MR. McCLELLAND: First of all, the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) made a grandstand play about giving up his quota price. I'd like to know how many other chicken farmers in British Columbia have a \$24,000-a-year job on the side and can afford to make that kind of grandstand action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't start that.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Attorney-General has left to perhaps go out and

[[Page 868](#)]

finally read those affidavits. I find it absolutely incredible that the Attorney-General of the province hasn't even had the good sense to read the affidavits that were filed in this House. He hasn't even had the sense to read them, and that's why he doesn't know what's in them, obviously.

The Attorney-General said that he couldn't expect that the Premier would recall what happened a year-and-a-half ago. I don't think anyone expects the Premier to recall exactly — or the Minister of Agriculture — what happened a year ago. Certainly, though, with the kind of charges that have been made in these sworn and signed affidavits, the Minister and the Premier should have no trouble recalling at least the substance of the remarks made at those meetings — even a year-and-a-half ago.

Certainly the Minister and Premier should have no trouble understanding or remembering what was said just one month ago, which is the period of time the B.C. Broiler Marketing Board affidavits are concerned with. That was one month ago, not a year-and-a-half ago — a month ago.

The Attorney-General said that the Minister or the Premier could not order or direct. That's been a major part of this discussion over the last few days. I just want to suggest that whether or not the Minister and the Premier have the authority to order or direct, they certainly took it upon themselves to order and direct. I just want to bring the House's attention once again to a couple of items that are contained in these affidavits.

One of them is in the affidavit by Mr. McAninch, chairman of the British Columbia Broiler Marketing Board, in which it stated very clearly:

"THAT on the 22nd day of December, 1973, I received from the said Minister of Agriculture a telegram, which telegram requested that the B.C. Broiler Marketing Board rescind the new broiler board order No. IM-76 ... pending further discussions with the Interior broiler production industry and the Department of Agriculture."

The Minister made an order and that order was carried out under fear of penalty. The affidavit said:

"THAT I was then and there informed by the said Mr. Peterson..."

He is referring now to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

"...that the Hon. Dave Barrett, Premier of the Province of British Columbia, had ordered that instead of the broiler permit policy contained in schedule 'A', that two of the 11 Kamloops-Okanagan broiler producers be allotted 20,000 birds per cycle and the remaining nine broiler producers be allocated 5,000 birds per cycle."

Had ordered. The Premier made the orders, and the people reacted in fear of penalty.

The affidavit also says:

"That Mr. Stupich" — the Agriculture Minister — "informed me that the Department of Agriculture in the matter of the Kamloops-Okanagan broiler permit policy was acting on orders from Mr. Barrett" — the Premier of British Columbia — "and Mr. Stupich informed me: 'It's out of my hands. The Premier has said this is the way it will be.'"

Orders once again from the Premier. Regardless of whether or not the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture had the authority to make those orders, they made them. The people at those meetings knew what was meant by those orders.

The affidavit also says:

"That the Minister informed me that he agreed with the marketing board position on at-large representation, using the following words:

"I agree with the board on representation but this is the word from the Premier."

That affidavit wasn't relating to events which took place 18 months ago; it was relating to events which took place in February, 1974. It shouldn't be too difficult for the Premier to recall what happened one month ago, particularly when, as he says himself, it was such an emotional issue.

The Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) says the Minister of Agriculture or the Premier cannot direct or order the marketing boards to do anything. I want to refer the House to the contents of the telegram sent to the British Columbia Broiler Marketing Board in February. The chairman of the board asked for a meeting and the Minister told him "no." No way! He says:

YOUR ORDER IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE IN THE PRESENT FORM AND MUST BE WITHHELD — must be withheld, not should be withheld —

UNTIL SUCH TIME AS INTERIOR PRODUCTION PROGRAMME SATISFACTORILY ESTABLISHED IN KEEPING WITH GOVERNMENT POLICY OF INDUSTRY EXPANSION. FAILURE TO WITHHOLD WILL BRING PROMPT GOVERNMENT ORDER SUSPENDING PENDING SUITABLE SETTLEMENT OF THIS ISSUE.

THE GOVERNMENT IS CONTEMPLATING SUCH ACTION WITH SOME RELUCTANCE BUT CANNOT ACCEPT THE ALTERNATIVE.

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) ordered the British Columbia Broiler Marketing Board to take certain action on fear of penalty from the government.

Now, the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) is completely out of line in suggesting.... Well, he's not completely out of line in suggesting that the Minister and the Premier don't have the authority to

[[Page 869](#)]

make those orders, but they made them anyway. The message came through loud and clear that if those actions and those orders were not acted upon, further action would be taken.

Now, there couldn't be anything plainer than that, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture has admitted to this House that there were threats, that the people involved were threatened. The Minister admitted that. Why won't the Premier do it? The Minister has said that there was political interference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. McCLELLAND: The Minister of Agriculture has admitted that. Why won't the Premier? There's no doubt that there was political interference, because if there wasn't political interference in this matter, then, Mr. Chairman, have the Premier tell this House why, in all of the Okanagan-Kamloops region with all that land lying available, is it that there can only be one site found for the new poultry processing plant that just happens to be in the riding of Shuswap. Tell us about that, Mr. Chairman — one site in the whole of the Okanagan-Kamloops region. Isn't that a funny coincidence?

There was political interference, there were threats made, and it's time the Premier started to admit it and open this question up. That's all we ask. Open the question up for public scrutiny. Level with the people of British Columbia.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, every time the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) rises to enter this debate, he illustrates in a clear way as to why we have reached the difficulty we are in today.

Interjection.

MR. McGEER: And the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams) illustrates with his interjections.

You want to bring about change in accordance with what you believe is right, and you do not care how you do it, who you abuse along the way, because anybody that's against you must be wrong and must be protecting privilege, real or imagined. Therefore it doesn't matter what methods you use and how often you deny you use those methods.

All of these things are irrelevant, because if you are a member of the New Democratic Party, the end justifies the means. Not one member of the New Democratic Party, during all of this debate, has suggested that the end does not justify the means. Not one — not even the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald).

What they have attempted to do is to complicate the issue by saying, "We had to bring about these changes, and the changes we wanted to bring about were right."

It's obvious, Mr. Chairman, that any government is only going to do those things in its policy which it believes is right. That is self-evident. Anybody who believes in the British parliamentary system — and I would hope those Members opposite still do believe in the British parliamentary system — recognizes that there are other legitimate points of view. That's why we have debates in this chamber. We can agree to disagree, but that other point of view has to be respected. Part of that respect means that you use only lawful methods.

That's what the Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) cannot recognize, even now, or the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams), and he could never recognize it when he was in opposition. He was the Member in opposition whose record will last longer in opposition than any Member of this House for improper charges and the improper use of the privileges of this assembly. We don't need lectures, long or short, on

righteousness from that Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back once again to the one question that the Premier has not answered — an allegation that he has not denied. I ask him once more for a direct answer now, Mr. Premier, through you, Mr. Chairman. Did you or did you not say to Mr. Brunsdon or anyone else who attended that meeting in October of 1972: "If you tell what went on inside my office I will deny every word of it"? Yes or no.

Mr. Chairman, if the answer is yes, how many others in the 2,500 interviews that have been held in the Premier's office, when threatened politically, have been given the same message as they went out the door? How many others?

I don't know. There may have been dozens, in the mining industry, the forest industry — who knows? Let's determine it first of all, Mr. Chairman, for what? The Egg Marketing Board.

Did the Premier or did he not tell the members of the Egg Marketing Board that if they repeated outside his office the things he said to them, he would deny every word of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall vote 2 pass?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye!

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, there was a Minister on his feet. If the Premier doesn't wish to answer, and if the Minister will pop down again as soon as you call a vote, I have other questions which I would like to ask. I defer to the Premier or to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Otherwise....

[[Page 870](#)]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I looked to my right and I recognize now the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. He was on his feet.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, it's really delightful to hear from Point Grey again, and hear the Member talk about referring to privilege and then to refer to it as "real or imagined."

The Member for Shuswap (Mr. Lewis) made it very clear that it was real, that there was a price tag on these quotas. I suggest the Member for Point Grey ask any housewife in British Columbia who has to face the price of eggs if the extra amount tacked on a dozen eggs is real or imagined — the kind of cost picture that's plugged into every consumer in British Columbia.

It seems the Members of the Liberal Party consistently miss the main issue. Today on the front page of *The Vancouver Sun* we have more information regarding egg production in northern British Columbia. What did a person supplying grain to a producer in northern British Columbia say? "A Dawson Creek chicken-feed retailer swore an affidavit Tuesday" — another affidavit — "that says the B.C. Egg Marketing Board tried to persuade him into cutting off supplies to a dissident Prince George producer." Does that disturb the Hon. Member for Point Grey? "The affidavit filed by Gerald Randall, manager of the National Grain Co. Ltd., says Ed Morgan, the egg board's former executive secretary, made the attempt more than two years ago. The affidavit comes on the heels of separate affidavits..." et cetera, et cetera. What the executive secretary suggested to the feed supplier was what could happen if he didn't fall in line with the egg board's wishes. What did he say about that? "He suggested to me what can happen. You can determine whether this was pressure or not." It's semantics, isn't it, Mr. Member? Something of a semantic dance, a semantic dance carried on by this opposition for days now in this Legislature.

MR. McGEER: ...and take action against the Premier while you're at it.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: In addition, the same article in today's paper:

"Link charged that the board is killing northern producers by refusing to allow their production to expand with the growing northern market. Since the board came into existence in 1968, the number of northern producers has fallen from 70 or 80 to 6 — three in Prince George, one each in Terrace, Vanderhoof and Quesnel, he said."

Now let's hear from the official opposition's representatives from some of those ridings out there. They really support the kind of privilege that the Member for the Liberal Party suggests may be imagined. Do you really think it's imagined? It's not imagined when a person goes into the supermarket. It's not imagined when somebody tries to become a producer in these growing market areas of the north or the Island or the Interior. That's not imagined; that's very real. It's a situation that clearly needs change.

There's no question that what's coming out from this one affidavit and then counter-affidavits is that the marketing board is nowhere near what it should be. It's abundantly clear that the main issue is that those marketing boards have to be changed. Change there should be in order to see that there is some justice both for the people who want to get into production in this province and those who want to consume the commodities they're producing.

MR. GIBSON: Mr. Chairman, I was very surprised and I must say delighted to hear the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources express such a high opinion for affidavits, because that's exactly what we've been talking about: affidavits. And now there's a counter-affidavit.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: Which would you prefer?

MR. GIBSON: I was just very happy to see that you had a general high impression of affidavits and that you were willing to quote them in this House. So perhaps the Minister might agree that it might be worthwhile to look into both of them.

To hear the Minister say the main issue is the marketing boards.... Would the Minister seriously tell this House that that is an issue more important than the word of the Premier? I don't think he would really say it's more important than that issue..

The Attorney-General had some useful comments a little bit earlier. He mentioned that it was, in his view, difficult to test affidavits a year and a half old. He didn't speak about the affidavits which are only a month old and which relate to the Broiler Marketing Board.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The Premier wasn't at that meeting....

MR. GIBSON: But the Premier was quoted at that meeting, Mr. Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Members please not respond to those speaking from their seats because their comments are not recorded in *Hansard*.

MR. GIBSON: The Premier, of course, was quoted at that meeting by a Deputy Minister, but I'll get back to that in a minute.

The Attorney-General went on to say that under

[[Page 871](#)]

the law the Premier could not order or direct a board. That's a bit like saying a man with a loaded gun at your head can't give you orders. He may not have the legal right to give you orders but you'll listen pretty carefully to what he says all the same. If there is just one big kid on the block and he is a bully, he might not have any authority but power. But what he says might be an order to the rest of the kids on the block.

So I'm not too certain as to how we should take that intervention of the Attorney-General.

Earlier on during the debate this afternoon the Premier said something across the floor to the effect of "Why should there be a judicial inquiry?" Surely he understands why. There has been lying going on here. There should be

an inquiry to find out exactly what. That's why I can't believe his decision that there be no committee, and that there be no inquiry. I think public decency will make him reverse that decision.

The Premier said to us that this is a public inquiry going on in this House. That's a very good thing; and if that's the case, can witnesses be heard? Will the Premier stand up now and tell this committee that witnesses can be heard in this public inquiry? Can we call them before the bar of this House, Mr. Chairman?

Who are these witnesses from a couple of meetings who haven't had their day in court yet in this case?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: What your dad would think about this after all he went through.

MR. GIBSON: Why don't you ask him, Mr. Minister? He's going to be here tomorrow.

At the first meeting, October 26, 1972, in addition to the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, there was Mr. Janzen, Mr. Unger, Mr. Wall, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Brunson, all from the Egg Marketing Board. We haven't yet heard from Mr. Janzen or Mr. Wall or Mr. Morgan. Can they be called before the bar of the House, Mr. Chairman? Would the Premier agree to that in this public inquiry we're having here, or that he says we're having here? How about the public servants that were at this meeting: Mr. Peterson, Mr. King, Mr. Pope, Mr. Gilchrist?

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS: How do you feel about tree farm licences?

MR. GIBSON: We'll talk about that later, Mr. Minister, on your estimates.

Can those four public servants be called before the bar of this House? And then in the second meeting there were Messrs. McAninch, Stafford, Liedtke and Harbridge, all from the marketing board. We have affidavits from two of them.

Can Mr. Liedtke and Mr. Harbridge be called before the bar of this House? Would the Premier agree to that in this public inquiry he says is going on into this business?

Mr. Peterson and Mr. King were there again? They have been very busy at these meetings. And there was Mr. Wood, another official and the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, we had a most unusual thing happen earlier on when the Minister of Agriculture was accompanied on the floor of this House by one of those gentlemen who knows a good deal about this. His name has been often used; it was Mr. Peterson, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, the man who told the broiler meeting, according to two sworn affidavits, that the Premier had ordered that certain things be done.

Mr. Peterson was right there, and the Minister was beside him. The Minister was beside himself at the same time, I think, because he was asked if he would be good enough to consult with this man who was right beside him, and who had direct knowledge of what happened. He was quoted in those affidavits.

The Minister was asked if he would consult with his Deputy on that, and the Minister said, "No."

This case is only one month old, Mr. Chairman; the memories are still good. Let's get the testimony of those men who were there while their memories are still good — before they're muzzled up.

Here's what happened. Why doesn't the government admit to it. They had two very worrisome cases. They had a case with the Egg Marketing Board and they had a case with the Broiler Marketing Board. They didn't like what those boards were doing and they called them in. They laid the wood to them and they pushed them around pretty good. They can argue that's good or bad; they can argue that's right or wrong, that the politics they were following were good or not. But the point is: why deny it if you're proud of it, if you did it?

If it didn't happen, why not deny it? The affidavits were very clear on the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think you're being political.

MR. GIBSON: I don't understand what the Premier has to gain except a reputation for not telling the truth. I don't understand what he has to lose if he is telling the truth. If it's a public inquiry, as was suggested earlier on, there is the bar of the House, there are the names of the men who can help clear this up.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I sat as much as I could all afternoon, except for one brief interlude for a moment, and I came back again. I've listened.

I understand now that the proposition has been made that the leader of the Liberal Party is going to do the same thing tomorrow. That's the report I

[[Page 872](#)]

have: he's been on the radio saying he's going to do the same thing tomorrow. If that report is correct then the matter raised by the Member in his high action becomes one of political grandstanding, predicting moves on the basis of a political calculation rather than any new evidence or argument. Straight political calculation.

If the leader of the minority party wishes to use the House in this manner, so be it, but it is really a manner of misuse if that story is correct. But let that rest on his head.

The opposition has been provided with absolutely nothing of substance with which to criticize this government over the past 18 months. They have selected affidavits and there are other counter-affidavits that reflect many years of emotional arguments between many people who are deeply involved in an industry. The question of reading an affidavit two years old versus the one of 18 months old is exactly the kind of nonsense that serves no useful purpose in solving a problem we're setting out to solve, and that is to assist that small entrepreneur in the north, the Interior and on Vancouver Island to get a fair shake.

How ironic it is, how ironic it is, that those free-enterprisers over there are the ones taking the side of collective privilege in one area and we're fighting for the small free-enterpriser. I find it, as a matter of irony, strange. I notice the wife of one of the people concerned, named in the affidavit, was quoted in the paper as saying, "I left Europe to escape socialism and now I have to turn to socialism for protection for our right to produce." Isn't that ironic?

We have had provided in this province 18 months of good, solid, sound government on behalf of the ordinary people of this province. As Premier of this province I defend that record with pride. I know being a socialist elected to office in British Columbia is like being part of the scourge. Being called a socialist is to be allowed to be labeled anything else that you care to go along with it. Every time we fought for policies or progress, it was always named socialist. Yet every time every other political party had to save its political skin, they accepted socialist policies step by step.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not unaware of the political motives. I'm not casting any doubts on the sincerity of the Members. They act in conscience the way they wish to act. But let all British Columbians measure what has gone on here the last few days. Let all British Columbians understand that the hate for socialism obliterates any rational approach to the British parliamentary system as it operates in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the bitterness and the hate that should always be avoided in politics has not been eradicated by at least one group in terms of their desire to return to power. That comes out in the inadequacy of their research and the stupid charges every day. That's the official opposition, full of bitterness and hate.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's poison.

HON. MR. BARRETT: It's poison in their system, Mr. Member, I know that. I feel there's very little that we can do to purge it because, really, it's the continued extension of one man through inheritance rather than a political party with a philosophy.

As for the Liberal Party, the reason they have the city seats is because, as I discovered when I was Leader of

the Opposition, they never went to the country. They never went to the little people right across the northern part of British Columbia and neither did my party, and we plead guilty to that.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: I spent two years travelling back and forth across this province, listening and learning about the problems of unequal opportunity. I still go back out every session. Unlike any other Premier I don't ride around in a Cadillac: I go as Premier on my own expenses, not on government expenses, and visit those people. Since the election I've travelled right across this province and I'll travel again.

The question of travelling in the jet. It would take me 127 years at the rate I'm going just to catch up with the Member for South Okanagan's record in one year on the use of that jet. That's a matter of record.

Interjections.

HON. MR. BARRETT: North Okanagan, North Okanagan.

Interjection.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You haven't had a chance to plane yet. At the same rate it would take me 350 years to catch up with the former Member for Kamloops (Mr. Gaglardi).

AN HON. MEMBER: What about flying Phil?

HON. MR. BARRETT: Today and the last few days we've seen the coalescence of the hostility by that group, a political decision by the Liberals, and, frankly, the indecision of the Conservatives. That's a matter for every Member's conscience; certainly it's a matter for mine.

But I tell you this: I knew when I came to this House in 1960 that being a socialist meant you were some kind of less-than-adequate Member. We have

[[Page 873](#)]

seen this for the last 18 months in this province in terms of one or two — not all hotliners — but one or two, and the use of this House by the opposition Members.

But I tell you this: it doesn't faze me one single bit because I know our cause is right on behalf of the ordinary people of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I came here to fight for the little people of this province, not for privilege, not for the protection of some group, but for everybody to have a fair chance. That's what we stand for. That's what all my motivation has been and that's what it will be as long as I breathe the clean air and am a Member of this House. The seat doesn't belong to me personally. I represent an expression of our political system and I'm extremely conscious of that after witnessing 20 years of a government that wasn't aware of it.

I tell you this, Mr. Chairman, not only am I proud of this government but I'm proud of every single Member who belongs to this House as representatives of our party. They came here from the turn of the century and they worked for almost 70 years till they finally became government.

We were aware of what kind of barrage we would be put up against. Some of us talked, in the days when we were in opposition, about what it would be like when we became government. It would be the focus, if nothing else worked, of personal attack. I have absolutely no objection to the fact that some of our predictions have come true this week.

Mr. Chairman, I now move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again. It further reports that a division took place in the committee and asks leave that the motion be recorded in the *Journals*.

Leave granted.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver-Little Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present report No. 1 of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills. I move the report be read and received Motion approved.

Report 1, Legislative Committee Room, March 6, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills begs leave to report as follows:

That the standing orders have been complied with relation to the respective petitions for leave to introduce the following bills:

An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter

An Act to Amend the British Columbia School Trustee Association Incorporation Act

The committee recommends that the respective petitioners be allowed to proceed with the said bills, all of which is respectfully submitted.

Roy Cummings, Chairman.

MR. CUMMINGS: I move the rules be suspended and the report adopted.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

[Return to [Legislative Assembly Home Page](#)]